World Marxist Review

PROBLEMS OF PEACE AND SOCIALISM

Volume 3 October 1960 No. 10

TWO SHILLINGS
AND SIXPENCE

Distributors of the English edition
CENTRAL BOOKS LTD
37 Gray's Inn Road
London, W.C.1

World Marxist Review

Workers of all lands, unite!

English edition of
PROBLEMS OF PEACE
AND SOCIALISM

Published in Prague

VOLUME 3 OCTOBER 1960 NUMBER 10

CONTENTS

	Page
M. Reimann. Peaceful Coexistence and the Class Struggle	2
M. Ennafaa. Tunisia's Independence and Neo-Colonialism	9
R. Garaudy. The struggle for Communism is the way to end the "Alienation" of Man	16
A. Obretenov. The Wealth of Life—the Wealth of Art	23
I. Koteles. The Church and Religion in the Hungarian People's Republic	29
G. Pokrovsky. Modern Science and the Conquest of Space	36
K. Zilliacus. The British Labour Party Today	41
E. Scharf. The Left Socialists and their Role in the Labour Movement	49
In Memory of Wilhelm Pieck	57
PAGES FROM HISTORY	
D. Ibarruri. The Heroic Path	59
ACTIVITIES OF THE COMMUNIST AND WORKERS' PARTIES	
Discussing Vital Problems of the Day	66
S. Al. Guatemalan Party of Labour Holds Congress	70
P. Keuneman. Success for the Policy of Unity	72
E. Viera. The Newspaper and Mass Campaigns	75
Fortieth Anniversary of the Communist Party of Australia	77
BOOKS AND JOURNALS	
S. V. The Inviolable Principles of Socialist Foreign Policy	79
E. Arab-Ogly. Executors of John F. Dulles' Will	83
COMMUNICATIONS AND COMMENT	
A. Bayer. Triumph of Life or a Crusade?	89
Y. Arbatov. *Ny Tid* Distorts our Words	91

Distributors of the English edition
CENTRAL BOOKS LIMITED
37 Gray's Inn Road,
LONDON, W.C.1.

Peaceful Co-existence and the Class Struggle

MAX REIMANN

PEACEFUL coexistence of the socialist and capitalist countries or atomic war—this is the choice facing the world. Never has the old phrase "there is no third way" resounded so forcefully. And never has such responsibility rested on the political parties, the people and the governments in all countries, first and foremost on the parties and governments of the leading countries. Present and future generations will judge the political leaders of our days primarily by what they did to secure peaceful coexistence and avert an atomic war.

In contrast to the misanthropic ideology of the aggressive imperialist circles who are ready to turn their own inevitable social demise into the destruction of all humanity, in contrast to those who still fail to realise the danger of an atomic holocaust or, conversely, who are so depressed and over-awed by the danger that they lack the strength to struggle, and in contrast to the pacifists who sow the illusion that the aggressors can be persuaded to stop being aggressors—*the Communist parties in all countries are unanimous in the belief that, despite the grave danger of the imperialists unleashing war, there is a real possibility of averting war; but this presupposes unsleeping vigilance in relation to aggressors, and struggle and still more struggle on the part of the forces standing for peace.*

The recent Bucharest meeting and its Communique re-affirmed that these ideas of the Twentieth and Twenty-First Congresses of the C.P.S.U., and the congresses of other Communist and Workers' parties, together with the ideas set out in the Declaration and Peace Manifesto of 1957, have stood the test of time, that they are the vital ideas of our times.

Yet it is against this principle of peaceful coexistence that imperialist reaction has launched its main attack. A tract put out by the "Moral Re-armament" organisation which, with Dr. Adenauer's help, is distributed gratis in the Federal Republic, and millions of copies of which are in circulation throughout Western Europe, claims that "propaganda for the abolition of atomic weapons and for peaceful coexistence means certain death". Reaction has recruited an army of falsifiers; all are harping on the theme: the Communists, the Soviet Union, stand by the Marxist-Leninist doctrine which proclaims the inevitable victory of communism throughout the world, a victory effected through class struggle, and for the Communists the class struggle signifies the use of force and resort to war. According to this interpretation the Communists' slogan of peaceful coexistence is simply a "manoeuvre" designed to "lull" the vigilance of the West as a preliminary to delivering a decisive military blow. Bourgeois Ministers and journalists, philosophers and historians, Jesuits and Right-wing Socialists are combing the writings of Marx, Engels and Lenin, selecting quotations out of context, misconstruing them, and even fabricating quotes all of which, it is alleged, "refute" the calls for peaceful coexistence sounded by Communist Party leaders. The late John Foster Dulles was a past master in this kind of "comparison", and it would seem that his mantle has now fallen on Adenauer and Nixon.

Attacks on peaceful coexistence are levelled also from the "Left"—for example, the Trotskyite *Fourth International*, which appears in several languages. On every page of every issue of this publication one can find oaths of allegiance to "revolutionary Marxism", and fine words against "world imperialism", and cheek by jowl we find in every page of every issue violent attacks on the "anti-Marxist" theory of peaceful coexistence and, in particular, on the peace policy of the Soviet Union and the C.P.S.U. which, we are told, is "reformist" and "revisionist", a Party which "sows illusions" and "hinders" the working class and the colonial peoples from fighting for liberation. Clearly the Trotskyites are acting as provocateurs, deliberately abetting imperialist reaction.

In one way or another the modern revisionists and reformists, avowed enemies of the socialist countries, deny that Soviet foreign policy is a policy of peace. To cite a case in point. Early this year the Right-wing leaders of the Social Democratic Party of Germany issued an anti-communist document which falsely asserted that: "The Soviet Union does not want peaceful coexistence."

As to the revisionists, they, denying the fundamental antithesis between the two social systems, advocate a "non-bloc policy" which, in effect, plays into the hands of the imperialist camp which approves it. The latest revisionist effort is a pamphlet by E. Kardelj entitled *Socialism and War*. Peaceful coexistence, according to Kardelj, leads to a situation in which "gradually, the problems of the antithesis between the socialist world and the capitalist world become of secondary importance". The call to reject war as a means of resolving the

contradictions between the socialist and capitalist countries is interpreted as the disappearance of the antagonistic nature of these contradictions and their automatic solution. No attempt is made to analyse the specific features of the international situation, there is no word of censure for the provocative policy of the United States. On the other hand, there is the oft repeated hint that socialism can be the source of aggression. And while much is said about the world being divided into military blocs nothing is said about the reasons which led to this situation, not even a whisper to the effect that it was imperialism, in the pursuit of its class interests, that unleashed the cold war and is doing all in its power to continue it.

In saying all this the revisionists claim that they are combating dogmatism. Referring to the "fundamental changes in the world", they break with Marxist-Leninist teaching and, in particular, with the proposition that the imperialist system continues to be the source of wars. On the other hand, there are dogmatists who have much to say about the need to wage effective struggle against revisionism, but in doing so reduce correct Marxist propositions to absurdity, and, in effect, ignore the changes that have taken place in the world, in particular the important fact that, in the conditions of today, the growing forces of socialism and democracy are in a position to prevent war. Whereas the revisionist identifies peaceful coexistence with social peace, the dogmatist identifies the class struggle with the inevitability of war between the socialist and capitalist countries. In both cases peaceful coexistence and the class struggle are declared to be incompatible. It is obvious that the dogmatists and the revisionists not only cannot get the better of each other in this "polemic", on the contrary, in their onesidedness the one complements the other and, although this is done from different angles, both direct their blows against Marxism-Leninism.

Genuinely creative Marxism, irreconcilable both with revisionism and dogmatism, is waging a struggle on two fronts.

Peaceful Coexistence as a Special Form of Class Struggle in the World Arena

Peaceful coexistence in no way contradicts the Marxist-Leninist thesis of the class struggle and the socialist revolution. The very posing of the question—"peaceful coexistence *or* class struggle", "peaceful coexistence *or* the victory of the world socialist revolution"—is wrong. In the first place, coexistence is, in itself, a special form of the class struggle. In the second, it does not annul other forms of the class struggle in the capitalist countries, but implies that this struggle will develop.

It would be erroneous to regard the peaceful relations between, say, the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.A. simply as relations between two countries, without taking into account the difference in their social nature. Socialism and capitalism differ from each other fundamentally, in principles and aims; one is the opposite of the other, and the struggle between them, far from being assigned a secondary place, becomes more and more decisive. *From the class standpoint this signifies relations between the working class, which has won power in some countries, and the bourgeoisie, still in power in the others.* Lenin's principle of peaceful coexistence derives from his theory of the world socialist revolution, according to which the revolution triumphs first in a few countries, or even in a single country. Hence, over a certain period we have the "cohabitation" of the socialist and capitalist countries.

But the point here is a special form of class struggle—*peaceful coexistence* between *countries* with differing social systems.

The irreconcilability of these countries in fundamentals, in principles and aims does not mean that armed conflict between them is inevitable.

However, a "world without arms is a world without wars" is only one aspect of the question. The other is expressed in the communist slogan "*for victory* in the peaceful competition with capitalism". This victory will not come of itself, however, it can be won only in struggle.

How, and in what way, does this class struggle take place?

As we know the class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie is waged on three main fronts: political, economic and ideological. There can be no conciliation between socialism and capitalism in any of these spheres, no "synthesis" of the two systems, no matter how hard bourgeois and reformist spokesmen try to prove that the reverse is true. In these spheres the victorious proletariat must demonstrate clearly and convincingly that socialism has decisive advantages over capitalism.

By way of example let us take the economic aspect. The basic economic task of the socialist countries is to surpass the corresponding level of the more developed bourgeois countries. The Communists base themselves on Lenin's well-known injunction that "in the last analysis, productivity of labour is the most important, the principal thing for the victory of the new

social system".[1] "We are exerting our main influence on the international revolution," wrote Lenin, "by our economic policy. . . . In this field the struggle has been carried forward on to a world scale. If we solve this problem we shall win on an international scale, surely and finally. That is why problems of economic upbuilding acquire quite exceptional meaning for us."[2]

In keeping with Lenin's counsel, Khrushchov has described the economic competition as "the main sphere" of the struggle between socialism and capitalism.

The Soviet Union was the first among the socialist countries to embark on the practical solution of this basic economic task. Having surpassed the United States in tempo and absolute annual growth of output, as well as in a number of decisive branches of science and technology, the Soviet Union will, in the near future, outstrip the social labour productivity of the leading capitalist country, provide its people with the highest standard of living, and take first place in the world both as regards absolute volume of output and per capita production. The Soviet economy, together with the rapidly developing economy of the other socialist countries, will, both qualitatively and quantitatively, exceed the economic level of the bourgeois world.

This growth of the socialist economy is the best guarantee that the imperialists will be prevented from starting a war.

"Peaceful coexistence can and should develop into peaceful competition for the purpose of satisfying man's needs in the best possible way" (Khrushchov). And this means that it is not merely a competition *between* two systems but it is also a struggle in which the peoples of the capitalist countries will decide from their own experience what system is best, and choose the best of them. The production of the capitalist and socialist countries meets on international markets, the policy and ideology of capitalism and communism clash at congresses and conferences, at exhibitions and during the exchange of visits by the citizens of the socialist and capitalist countries. Despite the attempts of the reactionaries to maintain former barriers and to erect new ones, hundreds of millions are becoming acquainted with socialism through thousands of channels, comparing the two systems and asking which gives the ordinary man the best life, creates the best conditions for the satisfaction of his material and cultural needs, and for releasing his initiative. Let us recall how attractive the communist outlook appeared to the ordinary people during Khrushchov's tour of the United States and other capitalist countries, and how the visits help to spread the truth about communism. And let us compare these visits with the sterile "agitation" Nixon tried to carry out on behalf of capitalism in the U.S.S.R. and in some other countries.

The confidence with which the Communists speak of the final victory of communism is not to the liking of the imperialists. But why, it may be asked, should the Communists have any doubt as to the peaceful victory of their ideas throughout the world?

Our confidence is based on a knowledge of the laws of history. It becomes clearer every day that communism, as the most progressive social system, will inevitably replace capitalism in the same way as capitalism in its day replaced feudalism. It stands to reason that we have nothing against the capitalists retaining belief in their own possibilities as long as ideas are not forced on anyone.

It should be stressed that *in reality* bourgeois politicians and ideologues regard peaceful coexistence as a special form of the class struggle. The more sober-minded of them, calling for a "regeneration" of the capitalist world, say: "The challenge of communism is not military but social." The ultra-reactionaries fear this challenge because they can see the writing on the wall. Rejecting peaceful coexistence, and plugging the arms drive and war on communism, they want to replace the peaceful form of the inevitable class struggle with armed struggle. As if they will find salvation in a war in which they will suffer not only social defeat (as will be the case in peaceful coexistence), but also physical destruction.

We say: let socialism show what it can do, and let capitalism do likewise, then the people can decide. The imperialists fear the verdict of the people, their doubts are growing as to whether their system will survive if the communist challenge is taken up. And this alarm and uncertainty are typical of the bourgeois mind today. Harry Schwartz, *New York Times* reactionary columnist, commented recently that one could not contemplate without alarm a future in which Soviet production will increase and the economic gap between the United States and the Soviet Union narrow, as it undoubtedly will. In this world, says Schwartz,

---

[1] V. I. Lenin, *A Great Beginning.*

[2] V. I. Lenin, *Concluding Speech at the Tenth All-Russian Conference of the R.C.P. (Bolsheviks). May* 28, 1921.

where terrible poverty is still the lot of the majority of people, the example set by the Soviet Union of superior rates in growth of production—should this continue—will be a big attraction for people and leaders in South America, Asia and Africa, where the bulk of the population of the world live and where poverty is greatest. But Mr. Schwartz deceives both himself and his class in thinking that the example of communism affects only the economically backward countries.

The development of the German Democratic Republic, a socialist country, is a case in point. The attractive power of socialism plays an exceedingly important part in dismembered Germany, where the two systems exist in the shape of two highly developed industrial countries and directly conflict with each other, even in the same city—Berlin. We would refer to an article on this score in the French weekly *Perspectives* of July 23rd, headed "Two Systems Compete". Mentioning the faster industrial development in the Democratic Republic compared with the Federal Republic, the author concludes: "It will be seen that the progress in Eastern Germany is absolutely astonishing, especially when one takes into account the periods compared. Western Germany, too, has not been asleep during these ten years! . . . Eastern Germany's seven-year plan, which will be completed in 1965, envisages an average annual national income growth of 7 per cent and 9 per cent increase in industrial production. According to our economic and financial criteria a rate of growth of this kind is almost unthinkable."

The influence exerted on Western Germany by the first worker-peasant State in German history is causing concern among the ruling circles in Bonn. A leading article in *Die Welt* of August 13th commented that on the basis of its economic stabilisation the G.D.R. will now go over to the offensive in all directions and Western Germany will soon find itself on the losing side.

When the Soviet Union solves its basic economic task and surpasses the U.S.A. in per capita production of all kinds of goods, and when the other socialist countries approach this goal, not only the people of the backward countries, but also those of the leading capitalist countries will see that communism is in all respects an incomparably better way of life than capitalism. And has there ever been a case of anyone refusing a better life once he has seen it for himself?

And so peaceful coexistence, as a special form of class struggle, creates the most favourable conditions for the fight for socialism on the world arena and ultimately, for the universal victory of socialism.

Peaceful Coexistence and Other Forms of Class Struggle in the Capitalist Countries

Peaceful coexistence obviously does not embrace the relations between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie in the capitalist countries and hence cannot be interpreted as signifying "class peace". It is applicable only to the countries which, in keeping with the actual state of affairs and with all juridical and moral standards, enjoy equal rights and are equally independent and sovereign. In the peaceful contest with the capitalist countries the socialist countries occupy firm positions, are in no way inferior to these countries and, in many respects, are superior.

Relations between the classes in capitalist society are a different matter. Neither in the economic, political, nor ideological spheres can these relations—unless one is blind or deliberately distorts the truth—be called equal. And who will say that the relations between the imperialist States and the colonial and semi-colonial countries are equal? What "social peace" can there be in these cases? Despite the glaring injustice of the situation the bourgeoisie has no intention of turning over any of its privileges to the proletariat. History shows that the proletariat has never obtained a single benefit gratis, nor a single gain as a gift from the bourgeoisie. The proletariat has fought for all its rights. But these, too, are negligible compared with what the bourgeoisie takes from the proletariat every day.

It is not the socialist countries, nor the Communist parties, that are to blame for the fact that the class struggle will go on in the capitalist world as long as this world continues to exist. The socialist countries can neither "begin" nor "end" revolution in the capitalist countries, they cannot "export" it hither, nor "import" it thence.

The theory of "instigating" and "exporting" revolution—the theory of adventurers—is profoundly alien to Marxism-Leninism. Consequently the working class headed by its vanguard, the Communist Party, having become the ruling class in a given country, has no intention of forcibly imposing either its economic or political system or its ideology on the people in the capitalist world. ". . . The victorious proletariat," wrote Engels, "can force no

blessings of any kind upon any foreign nation without undermining its own victory by so doing. Which of course by no means excludes defensive wars of various kinds."[3]

Revolution in one or another country is not a conspiracy, it is not a coup at the top, it presupposes a radical reorganisation of social relations, a reorganisation effected by the action and by the consciousness and will of millions in the particular country. "Revolutions are not made to measure, they are not timed to take place at this or that particular moment, they mature in the process of historical development and break out at a time determined by a whole complex of internal and external causes."[4]

Peaceful coexistence or a cold war leading to a hot war is a question of the *concrete conditions* of the working-class struggle in any capitalist country. The proletariat, wrote Lenin, "cannot regard with indifference or equanimity the political, social and cultural conditions of its struggle".[5] And it is by no means a matter of indifference to the modern proletariat whether it lives and fights under the conditions of peaceful coexistence or those of the cold war.

Lenin taught us that the working-class movement should always endeavour to create for itself, while still within the framework of capitalist society, the best possible arena for the battle, the greatest possible freedom for manoeuvring and the very best conditions for upholding the general interests of the working class and the nation. This applies both to the internal and to the international conditions of the struggle.

The point that foreign policy is a continuation of home policy is one of the fundamental points of Marxism-Leninism. Whether a particular government is waging the cold war or upholding peaceful coexistence is a matter that affects both its foreign and home policy.

What conditions does the cold war create for the proletariat's class struggle against the bourgeoisie?

The cold war, a product of imperialism, is, in its turn, a means for strengthening the positions of the ultra-reactionary monopoly bourgeoisie, a means of oppressing the proletariat as a class and of suppressing the democratic movement. It signifies a frenzied attack by reaction on all fronts of the class struggle.

Militarisation of the economy is the handmaid of state-monopoly capitalism, with the subordination of the machinery of State to the war-industry monopolies, which wax rich at the expense of the taxpayer. Their tentacles encompass ever-broader spheres of the country's economic, political and ideological life. Never before in such countries as the United States or Federal Germany has the machinery of State been so subordinated to the war-industry monopolies. Never before in peace time has the top brass exerted such an all-round and deadly influence on all spheres of the life of the nation and never has it been so autocratic towards parliaments and the governmental bodies. The Pentagon and the West German Nazi generals provide striking illustration of this.

In the imperialist countries the military and police apparatus—the main bulwark of the ruling classes in the struggle against the democratic and socialist forces—becomes incredibly swollen at times of international tension.

Behind the demagogy of the need to "rally the nation against the danger from without", the imperialist bourgeoisie hastens to deprive the working people of the rights won by them in the course of long and tenacious struggle. The reprisals taken against the organisations of the working class and its vanguard, the Communist and Workers' parties, are particularly brutal.

In the United States the Taft-Hartley Act, spearheaded against the trade unions and the right to strike, belongs to the cold-war period. McCarthyism, the American variety of the Nazi methods, with its persecution of Communists, racial terror and medieval witch hunt was also in its heyday. The best people of the United States were hounded and thrown into prison, while some met their death on the electric chair, as a result of being falsely accused of "un-American activity".

The cold war paved the way to N.A.T.O. for the West German revenge seekers, paved the way to the remilitarisation of the Federal Republic and to the insistent claims for atomic weapons for the Bundeswehr. Hitler's generals, who only yesterday were plotting the Second World War, are now plotting a blitzkrieg against the Democratic Republic and the other socialist countries. Colossal taxation, which is constantly being raised, is levied on the West German working people. Nearly D.M.5,000 million have been filched from the social security fund to pay for rocket weapons and other war materials ordered by Defence Minister

---

[3] K. Marx, F. Engels, *Selected Correspondence* (Letter to Kautsky, September 12th, 1882).
[4] V. I. Lenin, *Speech at a Moscow Province Conference of Factory Committees, July 23rd*, 1918.
[5] V. I. Lenin, *Militant Militarism and the Anti-Militarist Tactics of Social Democracy*.

Strauss from the American and West German monopolies. For this reason the working people no longer benefit from some of the social insurance gains won by them eighty years ago.

In order to gag the working class and overcome the popular resistance, the Bonn imperialists are again resorting to Nazi methods. They have banned the Communist Party. The courts have passed heavy sentences on thousands of supporters of peace and democracy. The Adenauer Government gives its blessing to the insolent actions of revenge-seeking associations and S.S. organisations; inspirers of anti-Semitism and racism, ex-Nazis and war criminals are appointed to high government posts.

Recent experience has re-affirmed the relationship between the cold war on the international arena and the reactionary policy in the capitalist States. The U.S. Government and the Adenauer regime took immediate advantage of the Summit breakdown arranged by them and of the resulting tensions, to place huge new war orders and to carry through measures for oppressing the people. Eisenhower has called for additional billions of dollars for so-called special cases, which evidently include new acts of provocation against peace and national independence. Strauss went to the U.S.A. to obtain the Polaris missile, unquestionably an aggressive weapon. This would enable the German imperialists to unleash provocations "on their own" and thus embroil the people of the other N.A.T.O. countries in an atomic war. The Adenauer Government is making the necessary preparations at home by means of emergency laws and universal labour conscription. That means that already in peace time Western Germany is preparing for total war.

Under cold war conditions the working people's struggle for pressing and vital needs is denounced as "subversive activity" and suppressed under war-time "emergency laws". Demands for higher wages and better conditions are qualified as "undermining State security". Anti-communism is the pretext by means of which the screws of exploitation can be tightened, taxes increased, evil deeds cloaked and anyone summarily dealt with. Should the people complain about their conditions? Communism is to blame! Should the workers protest? Communism is to blame! Communism is responsible for all the bad; from anti-communism comes all that is good.

In these conditions the reactionary forces are forming alliances not only on a national, but on an international scale. N.A.T.O., S.E.A.T.O., C.E.N.T.O.—these holy alliances of international reaction are products of the cold war. And as their founders have often enough admitted, they exist only because the tensions are kept up.

War psychosis and anti-communism enable the ruling elements to deceive the people. It is not fortuitous that during a cold war period it is difficult to get to know any truth about the socialist countries. And simultaneously it becomes easier to justify participation in aggressive military blocs. The part played by these overt and clandestine plots is clear enough: they serve not the purpose of defence, because no one threatens those participating in them; their paramount purpose is to crush the democratic and national-liberation movement. Perhaps this point is most strikingly illustrated by the South Korea of Syngman Rhee and Huh Chung. On April 29th, Walter Lippmann commented in the *New York Herald Tribune* that the ". . . South Korean State was created by American arms, is protected by American power, and is maintained by American subsidies."

Thus one cannot but see that the cold war makes it more difficult for the proletariat to wage its class struggle, it also hampers the development of the national-liberation movement. At the same time, however, it means that enormous explosive material is accumulating under the edifice of imperialism and the "victories" of reaction will but pave the way to its crushing defeat. Not in any circumstances do the peoples or the Communist parties lay down their arms, they carry on the fight.

What are the conditions under which the proletariat wages its class struggle against the bourgeoisie at times of relaxed international tension, at times of a comparatively widespread, although forced, recognition by the capitalist governments of the need to enter into peaceful relations with the socialist countries?

The Appeal addressed to all workers, to all democrats by the seventeen Communist parties of the capitalist countries of Europe states: "The steps taken along the road towards easing the tension . . . have not been in vain. . . . The favourable changes which have taken place in the international situation open up new opportunities for the fight for liberty, to defend democracy, to re-establish it where necessary and to give it new vitality. These changes are a blow to anti-communism."

An easing of the tension deprives the imperialist bourgeoisie of its main card, the card with which it justifies its attack on democratic rights—"the danger from without". If no

danger threatens the "country", how is one to justify the huge military expenditure to the people, to those who are daily experiencing the shortage of housing, schools and hospitals, who are suffering under the tax burden and the high cost of living and for whom an old age without security is in store?

Peaceful coexistence lays bare the class contradictions of bourgeois society and helps to tear from them their chauvinist covering and militarism, makes them more comprehensible to the people and, consequently, furthers the confrontation of the social and political forces and rallies the working population around the working class.

The fight for peace, peaceful coexistence and general and complete disarmament is not of a specifically socialist, but of a universally democratic character. But any arbitrary division or even the counterposing of the democratic and socialist tasks of the revolutionary movement are alien to Marxism-Leninism and have nothing in common with the needs of life.

Any democratic gain won by the masses benefits the working class, for it more than any other class in capitalist society is in need of political liberties without which, as Lenin pointed out, "a broad, open and free class struggle, political education, the training and rallying of the proletarian mass" is impossible.[6]

Either good-neighbourly relations and international co-operation, or international tension and growing mistrust between the countries—that is the fundamental question on which not only the working people, but certain bourgeois circles, are divided from the ultra-reactionaries. Hence the fight for peace broadens the social basis of the democratic movement. In the course of this struggle the masses learn to distinguish their friends from their enemies, to rally their forces. It is this kind of experience that the masses need to draw them closer to and eventually participate in the struggle for socialism.

The significance of the fight for peace cannot be overestimated. But in view of the fact that the monopolies and their governments, that is, the forces barring the way to socialism, are the worst enemies of peace and peaceful coexistence, whereas the most consistent and selfless peace fighters are the working-class parties and the governments of the socialist countries—the vanguard force in the fight for socialism—defence of peace is vital to the cause of socialism and furthers the unfolding of the revolutionary movement. The more effectively and the more vigorously the Communists head the struggle against the atomic war danger, against the arms drive, for peaceful coexistence and disarmament, the greater will be their influence on the masses, whom they guide in the anti-imperialist struggle.

In the past most revolutionary actions ended tragically not because the revolutionary forces were not in a position to curb the internal counter-revolution, but because the internal reactionaries were aided by external reactionary forces whose intervention strangled the revolution. This was the case in 1871 at the time of the Paris Commune, and was the case in 1919 in Bavaria and Hungary. Those same bourgeois who spread lies about "export of the revolution" always export reaction if the conditions permit them to do so.

Translated into reality the principles of peaceful coexistence make joint action between home and foreign reaction and aggression against revolutionary peoples difficult and even impossible. Why is it that the rulers of the United States, the biggest capitalist country, cannot make up their minds to put their hands on the small and heroic people of Cuba as they did six years ago in the case of Guatemala? Partly, it is because they cannot justify to the world public violation of the principles of peaceful coexistence, which the people everywhere regard as their most precious possession. But also it is because the principle of non-intervention not only rests upon morality and law, it has behind it the granite foundation of the economic, political and military might and the prestige of the socialist countries. The forces of peace and democracy are in a position to *impose* this principle on the imperialist powers. That this is no utopian dream but living reality, is proved by the failure of the imperialist aggression in Egypt, the Lebanon and other countries. And was it not the standpoint adopted by the socialist parties, by the Communist and Workers' parties fighting for the principles of peaceful coexistence that enabled the peoples of Egypt, Iraq and other countries to throw off the yoke of colonialism? All the major victories won by the working people during recent months—Cuba, the Congo, South Korea, Japan, Italy, etc.—were undoubtedly facilitated by the fact that after so many years the lies about communism were exposed.

If the working class and the Communist parties are compelled to take to armed struggle, this is solely because it is imposed upon them by the reactionaries. With each fresh outbreak

---

[6] V. I. Lenin, *The Democratic Tasks of the Revolutionary Proletariat.*

of the cold war reaction becomes more brazen and goes over to the offensive, with the result that the possibility of achieving socialism by peaceful means becomes less.

Socialism makes headway under peaceful coexistence, because the latter facilitates the peaceful transition of the capitalist countries to socialism without civil war. If formerly, during the early years of the general crisis of capitalism, this possibility was rare, now, with the emergence of the world socialist system, and the strengthening of the peace forces, it may be a more frequent occurrence. This is important, for Communists have always stood for the most peaceful way of achieving revolution, and this is rooted in the profoundly humanist nature of our teaching. Our aim is that the democratic and socialist revolutions should take place with the minimum losses, that the revolutionary process in each capitalist country should be as painless as possible.

When the principles of coexistence are successfully implemented, tensions arise in the system of imperialist pacts, some sections of the bourgeoisie, and the governments in some of the capitalist countries favour economic relations with the socialist world and disapprove of the violence of militarism—for example, in Western Germany. Hence the growing contradictions in N.A.T.O., the main imperialist bloc.

For peaceful coexistence to become a reality persistent and resolute struggle is needed by the working class and all the peace-loving forces against imperialism, the mortal enemy of the working class and of the people. On the other hand the efforts to avert war and the success registered in implementing the principle of peaceful coexistence help to broaden the class struggle in the capitalist countries; they further the democratic and national movement.

* * *

Peace and socialism are indivisible. Socialism flourishes in the conditions of peace.

It is sometimes asked, however: if, in the event of imperialism unleashing world war, it is destroyed in the process, would not that be a net gain for socialism?

Communists have no doubt whatever that communism will triumph. But the main thing in communism is, as the young Marx said, its "real humanism", the main thing is the maximum satisfaction and the development of man's material and spiritual needs. Generally speaking, war is alien to socialism, war can be started only by imperialism, although its starting will hasten the end of imperialism. Nuclear war, furthermore, in addition to destroying vast productive forces of society, to laying waste entire countries and killing hundreds of millions of people, will affect the generations as yet unborn. Who would want to build socialism on this basis? How can peaceful coexistence be dismissed as "tactics", as a "manoeuvre" when it is called upon to save mankind from these possible consequences? Communists do not dream of a primitive communism, they are fighting for the most highly developed society, a society populated not by the maimed and the crippled, but healthy people full of the joy of life. That is why they regard peaceful coexistence as the only acceptable way.

Tunisia's Independence and Neo-Colonialism

MOHAMED ENNAFAA

"NO matter what else you may do, do something at least to ensure that Africa marches alongside Europe," said President Bourguiba last February in an interview with the West German *Industriekurier*.

This was not the first time that the President of Tunisia had made appeals of this kind to the capitalist countries, including the United States. Recall, for example, his proposal for a "round-table conference" at which, he believed, the capitalist powers would voluntarily give up their colonies and set out with them upon the road of "co-operation".

This view fits in, to a degree, with the schemes of some of the big bourgeoisie of Europe and the U.S.A., who sometimes think aloud about colonialism changing its skin and coming to terms with the nationalist forces in the Afro-Asian countries; concessions would be made, but they would be designed in a way that would keep these countries in the orbit of capitalism.

In this connection, using the present situation in Tunisia as an example, I would like to take a closer look at some of the developments in the newly-independent countries. It goes without saying that this article does not pretend to exhaust such a complex problem as neo-colonialism, which has its specific manifestations in each country although it also has common features.

French Colonialism in Search of a Policy

In July 1954 the French Prime Minister of the day, speaking in Carthage, said that his government was prepared to grant Tunisia internal autonomy. It seemed at that time that French imperialism had at last drawn the correct conclusion from the lessons it had received, that it would try to modify its old colonial habits in order to accommodate itself to the changes that had taken place in the world. The agreement with Tunisia, reached at the time of the Geneva conference on Vietnam in 1955, could be regarded as a victory for that part of the French big bourgeoisie which favoured compromise with the growing national bourgeoisie in the colonies.

Accused by the colonialists of the "classical" type of "surrendering their positions", the advocates of a compromise argued that they alone were right, since those who wanted to cling to everything ran the risk of losing everything. By means of a political concession and abandoning direct administration of the country, they hoped to save the main thing—the economic and strategic positions. This part of the big bourgeoisie believed that by yielding political power in Tunisia and Morocco they would be able, by using new methods, to maintain Algeria as a "French department" and, with it, their main positions in the other two countries.

Algeria, however, took to arms for national independence. Its struggle, for the crushing of which the tried and tested machine of colonial war was set in motion, has radically changed the situation not only in North Africa but also in other parts of the continent, thereby frustrating the designs of the neo-colonialists. Since then it has become difficult for the French bourgeoisie to formulate and prosecute a political line in relation to its former colonies.

Since the proclamation of Tunisian independence, i.e., since 1955, the French imperialists have resorted at one time to promises to settle the outstanding issues and improve French-Tunisian relations, at another time to threats and intimidation, and even to violation of our borders. But be the methods what they may, they have but one aim—a compromise which, in exchange for Tunisia's political independence, would secure her neutrality in the Algerian conflict, and simultaneously safeguard the French economic and strategic positions in our country.

This compromise is impossible, for our people regard the struggle of the Algerian people as their own struggle. And no matter how the French imperialists acted they have always encountered the solidarity of the two peoples. In 1957 the French rulers, by way of reprisal, discontinued economic aid. Simultaneously, they started regular flights along our borders, and in February 1958 bombed the village of Sakiet-Sidi-Youssef. These actions, however, far from weakening the solidarity of our people with the people of Algeria, have, on the contrary, strengthened their conviction that there can be no co-operation with the French imperialists.

French Capital and Tunisian Economy

Since the war in Algeria has raised insurmountable obstacles to co-operation with France, the Government of Tunisia turned to other capitalist countries for economic aid, particularly to the U.S.A. In any case this consideration has been used to justify before the masses its foreign policy, which has been pro-Western.

The other imperialist states, and above all the U.S.A., could not, naturally, remain indifferent to the deterioration in French-Tunisian relations. At crucial moments the U.S. government even directly interfered. For example, when France discontinued its aid to Tunisia, the United States suggested "aid" on the same conditions, thus using the opportunity to get a toehold in Tunisia. During the conflict caused by the bombing of Sakiet-Sidi-Youssef, the U.S. government offered its "good services" in order somehow to reconcile the contradictions and safeguard the "free world" from dangerous consequences.

But the American, and even more so the West German, capitalists show no particular desire to "co-operate" on a large scale with Tunisia. This is partly because foreign capital is now generally seeking to penetrate into the economically richer and more "profitable" countries. This "restraint" of U.S. and West German capital is explained in part by the fact that the Atlantic allies, despite their antagonisms, continue to regard North Africa, including Tunisia, as a French bailiwick and believe that as yet there is no pressing need to "fill the vacuum" there. This, of course, does not mean that the U.S. and other monopolies are generous towards their French partners, or that they are neglecting Tunisia and not penetrating its economy.

Although forced to make political concessions in both Tunisia and Morocco, French imperialism has no desire, however, to relinquish these possessions. It has not given up its strategic bases, and it maintains armed contingents on our territory. The French army, which, after the bombing of Sakiet-Sidi-Youssef, found itself in an extremely hostile environment, has had to withdraw from some of its military posts, which were too numerous in the country and too obvious in the bigger towns. But it has entrenched itself in Bizerta, where sizable military contingents are quartered, not to mention aircraft and other modern weapons not available to the Tunisian army. It should be said that the French troops in Algeria located along our border are a permanent threat to the security of our country.

French imperialism, however, is desperately keen to maintain its key positions in the Tunisian economy and, in an effort to strengthen them, is resorting to new methods.

After the proclamation of independence the colonialists had to relinquish a number of public utilities which had been in their hands since the time of the protectorate. Railroads, city and suburban transport in Tunis, electricity, water and gas supplies came under State management. But for all that the former concessionaire companies lost only the profits of the enterprises; their movable and immovable property (with the exception of production premises) remained in their hands.

The Tunisian government purchased 95 per cent of the shares of Les Madragues fishing company—hitherto the property of the Banque de l'Union Parisienne. The government also owns 50 per cent of the shares of a company engaged in extracting salt from the sea.

In the mining industry Compagnie de Gafsa, after long negotiations, became a mixed company, with half the shares owned by the Tunisian government. This, of course, was a gain for the State. The State now exerts a considerable influence over this big company, which in addition to phosphate mines owns the railway line linking the town of Gafsa with the port of Sfax, a superphosphate plant and nearly 40,000 acres of land. Compagnie de Gafsa also profited from the deal: it secured itself against complete nationalisation, while marketing difficulties are shared with the Tunisian government.

Despite the fact, however, that the State has taken over some of the enterprises and some of the lands formerly owned by settlers, the French capitalists still occupy the key positions in Tunisian economy, even if they make no fresh investments. They own considerable mineral wealth, including the iron-ore fields in Djérissa. They have secured rights of oil prospecting and transportation: the oil pipeline linking Edjeleh with the port of Skhira is run by the Compagnie de Transports par Pipeline au Sahara (TRAPSA), a subsidiary of Compagnie de Recherches et d'Exploitation du Pétrole au Sahara (CREPS). French capitalists run road transport, airlines, and much of the marine transport. They control a considerable part of our agriculture—nearly all the wine-making, part of the grain and citrus production, etc. Lastly, French capital has preserved its banks, though with the setting up of the Tunisian Bank Company and the Central Bank it no longer exercises control over credits.

The dependence of Tunisian economy on that of France can be seen in its tie-up with the franc area and, more strikingly, in the nature of the trade between the two countries. Commenting on the new budget the Minister of Finance said in the National Assembly: "Our economy has been and in large measure still is tied, as by a navel-string, to the French economy."

True, since Tunisia became independent French imperialism has had to forgo some things. But only some things. The June 1955 agreements concerning internal autonomy maintained in the interests of the French monopolies the customs union of the two countries, obligatory parity of their currencies and the right of the colonialists to issue paper money. This state of affairs continued till 1958. Then, as a result of bilateral agreements, some essential changes were introduced. Tunisia gained the right to have her own currency—the dinar—which was unaffected by the 1959 devaluation of the French franc. The customs union was terminated in October 1959. Moreover, our country enjoys a relative freedom in the franc area which enables her to control her currency resources. These changes have, undoubtedly, loosened the economic grip, and have enabled Tunisia directly to conclude trade agreements with other countries, including the socialist countries.

France's share in Tunisia's foreign trade is still the biggest, although it has declined somewhat (compared with 1957 and 1958) owing to the increased trade with other countries. In 1959 France accounted for two-thirds of our imports and 51 per cent of the exports (two-thirds of exported foodstuffs, one-fourth of exported raw materials and one-third of exported semi-finished goods). Since about three-quarters of our exports to France consist of foodstuffs, while imports consist of manufactured goods, the trade deficit with that country is

very considerable. Last year the deficit amounted to some 12 million dinars—exports did not cover even three-quarters of the imports. It is as yet premature to speak about the results of the abrogation of the customs union, which took place in the third quarter of 1959. But it can be said that by virtue of the economic system bequeathed to us by the protectorate, our agriculture, for example wine and grain growing, is still dependent on the French market. Moreover, the abolition of the customs union has not completely done away with preferential trade tariffs between the two countries: some goods find their way to our market tax free, while others enjoy preferential tariffs.

Thus the political independence of Tunisia, which has not been followed by radical changes in her economic structure, has not deprived French capital of the key positions in the country. And if immediately after the proclamation of independence French capital began to flow out of Tunisia, at present some French capitalists as well as the capitalists of other countries would like to regain their positions. They have a stake in the new undertakings, and are anxious to draw into them Tunisian capitalists provided, however, that at least 51 per cent of the shares are held by foreign capital.

But it is not the floating of new companies that gives the French imperialists their strong positions. Relying chiefly on their old positions, unaffected by structural reforms, they regard Tunisia as their happy hunting ground, and act as the protector of the interests of the entire capitalist world in this country and throughout North Africa.

It should be emphasised that in order to retain its advantageous positions, enabling it to exploit a considerable portion of Africa, French imperialism is forced to manoeuvre, to engage in rivalry with its Western partners. In this rivalry it often has to agree to the participation of the other powers in exploiting a particular zone in Africa in exchange for their support on other issues.

For example, the "internationalisation" of the Sahara oil, the result of an agreement with the International Oil Cartel, has practically subordinated the French oil trusts to the omnipotent American capital in exchange for U.S. support in the Algerian conflict. In this respect *La Vie Français* commented on January 30th, 1959: "The entry of Standard Oil into the Sahara . . . substantially strengthens France's positions in the Sahara and, consequently, in Algeria, inasmuch as this act impels our partners to defend our positions." *Le Monde* wrote on February 5th, 1959, that the internationalisation of the Sahara was "in many respects also internationalisation of the Algerian problem, and without any political inconveniences".

On the other hand, the European capitalist centralisation in connection with the establishment of the Common Market and other agencies has resulted in mutual infiltration of French and West German capital, which seeks to subordinate the Sahara to the Eurafrica plans. Beginning with 1956 companies and consortiums for the exploitation of African resources have been established on the initiative of the French banks. These include also West German banks and the banks of other capitalist countries. A French-German committee with an appropriate sub-committee for overseas affairs has been set up. At a meeting of this sub-committee a spokesman of the Banque de Paris et des Pays-Bas said: "In view of the nationalist movements, which overestimate their possibilities, it would be a good thing if an association of European nations, belonging to the old civilisation, jointly acted to exploit the resources of the overseas territories." The same gentleman added: "Germany in addition to its great industrial and financial potential is a model country with a reputation untarnished by colonial policy."

Even at a time when the U.S., West German and other capitalists prefer not to quarrel with French imperialism, at a time when the foreign policy of the Tunisian government gives them no trouble whatever, the foreign monopolies, their eyes on the future, are trying to infiltrate into Tunisia.

Infiltration of U.S. and Other Capitalists

United States interest in Tunisia is masked in the guise of economic and technical aid. It is not establishing military bases although Tunisia forms a part of the strategic area between Morocco and Tripolitania. There is, however, an American mission of the International Co-operation Administration, headed by an Admiral with a group of experts who make a minute study of every aspect of the country's economic activity. This mission was established under the bilateral Tunisia-U.S. agreement signed on March 26th, 1957. Referring to the purpose of this mission, its head said that the task was somehow to take care of capital investments, on the one hand, and on the other, to assist for a more or less lengthy period in training technical personnel for the various branches of the economy.

It is easy to see that this statement consists of deliberately vague expressions and has nothing at all to say about industrialisation.

What is this U.S. "aid" to Tunisia and what are its results? According to official data published in December 1959 it is as follows:

*In thousands of dinars**

	Special Economic Aid	*Technical Co-operation*	*Credits Fund for Economic Development*	*Aid on the Basis of Law 480 on Agricultural Surpluses*	*Total*
1957 ..	3,360	210		3,115	6,685
1958 ..	6,310	546		2,772	9,628
1959 ..	8,400	693	1,008	3,948	14,049

*1 dinar = 1.17 NF francs.

The table requires an explanation. It should be said first that the "aid" is somewhat insignificant. Then, as the figures show, it mainly boils down to agricultural surpluses, chiefly grain, to be used as remuneration for the unemployed engaged in public works. The "aid" also includes loans, but the condition on which they are granted is "profitability" as the term is understood by American capitalists. This makes it extremely difficult to put the credits to practical use. Moreover, a sizable portion of the loans is in the form of "commodity credit". A definite share of the "aid" is said to be gratis and "without strings". In reality this is not so. The aid is not given to the State or co-operative industrial and agricultural enterprises. True to itself, Washington is averse to having anything to do with the public sector. But there is little private capital in Tunisia, so that any more or less large enterprise can only be a State-owned, or if in agriculture, a co-operative enterprise.

The "technical co-operation" is regulated by strict provisos, demanding from each project the following utilisation of the credits: 40 per cent as remuneration for the experts, 40 per cent for training specialists chiefly in the United States, and 20 per cent for the purchase of equipment for demonstration. Clearly in view of these stipulations it will be a long time before Tunisia will have its national technicians. Meanwhile, it will have to invite U.S. experts.

What we see, then, is that U.S. "aid", not only because of the insignificance of its volume when compared with the country's needs, but above all in view of its nature, is a means of maintaining our country as a raw-materials appendage to the capitalist world and a barrier in the way of structural changes, instead of being a spur to economic development. Apart from a pulp mill the construction of which has been entrusted to U.S. private capital, the United States has not taken any part in developing new branches of economy in Tunisia.

If we turn to the international organisations under American control they, while never saying "no" to our requests, are still "studying" the plans of the Tunisian Government. Eugene Black, President of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, arrived in Tunisia on June 2nd. He had come, he said, to find out what aid his Bank could give Tunisia, and added that the purpose of his visit was to gather information. During his four-day visit Black conferred with the President of the Republic, with representatives of the government and business community, and with experts. But how and when the International Bank will grant the Tunisian request for credits is uncertain. In all probability we will have to wait a long time. In reality, the interest of the U.S.A. in Tunisia boils down to preserving and consolidating its political influence, which can be used in prosecuting its policy in relation to the other African countries.

On December 31st a columnist of one of the Parisian weeklies summed up the views of Anglo-Saxon diplomats as follows: "Why are we so interested in Tunisia? We know that this is a small country without any political, economic and strategic significance. But it is a pilot country. It shows the middle way to decolonisation and can serve as an example for Black Africa. Our success in Tunisia will ensure success also in the other African countries."

The neo-colonialists are trying to strengthen their ideological influence in the countries which have won political independence. The U.S. Embassy in Tunis, for example, with a powerful propaganda machine at its disposal, is trying might and main to "sell" the idea of a "good America" with no imperialist aims whatever. The same political considerations are behind the desire of U.S. imperialism to preserve its ideological sway in the Tunisian trade unions through their leaders. As a result, the Tunisian trade unions refused to withdraw from the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions and participate in the establishment of the All-African Federation of Trade Unions.

To one or another degree other capitalist countries, too, though lacking the means at the disposal of the United States, are interested in Tunisia.

West German capitalists have founded a Bureau for Technical Research. Then there is a German-Tunisian trade association through which the West German capitalists maintain contact with Tunisian business interests. In 1959 they delegated thirty-five industrialists to the Tunisian Fair. Operating in Tunisia is an export-import company which deals with marketing the products of Krupp, Mannesmann and other firms. At the same time these West German capitalists display no interest whatever in Tunisia's industrialisation.

Early this year a trade and technical agreement was concluded between Tunisia and Western Germany. The latter, however, attached the following condition to "economic and technical co-operation": negotiations should begin in Bonn to work out a convention guaranteeing capital investments. In an interview with President Bourguiba a correspondent of *Industriekurier* specified the guarantees which they had in mind. He put the question point-blank: what guarantees can the government provide against nationalisation? This means that West German capitalists are willing to "help" on the condition that Tunisia will adhere to a policy of their liking: no nationalisation, free flow of capital and profits, guaranteed profits, i.e., low wages, etc.

In the sphere of trade, Western Germany is at pains to sell much and buy little. West German imports from Tunisia rose from DM 11.1 million in 1958 to 12.3 million in 1959, while exports to Tunisia rose from DM 9.4 million to 19.4 million.

Italian capitalists, although they speak about respect for their French "brothers", have also joined the race to penetrate into Tunisia. They, it is true, are not displaying the same vigour as, say, in Southern Rhodesia, the Congo, Ethiopia or even in Egypt. The Ital-Consult research company, however, cannot be said to be inactive: a Tunis-Consult company has emerged which engages in research and designing, invites architects, goes in for urban development, but turns its back on industrialisation.

FIAT, too, is doing well through the medium of an export-import company. The abolition of horse-drawn transport, regarded as an anachronism, and of tramways as out-moded means of transportation, has enabled FIAT and its middlemen in Tunisia to strike a good bargain—the company is supplying Tunisia with trucks and buses.

In June Tunisia was visited by Signor Mattei, head of the Ente Nazionale Indrocarburi (ENI), whose arrival coincided with that of the President of the International Bank. Signore Mattei's chief interest lay in oil. Spurred on by the competitive struggle he was more inclined to make greater concessions than his "brother-capitalists" in other countries. As a result of his talks with government officials an agreement was signed for the construction of an oil refinery in Skhira, the terminal point of the oil pipeline from the Edjeleh fields. According to the press this will be a mixed enterprise: the Tunisian government will be a partner of the ENI, holding 50 per cent of the shares. The government cedes to the latter the right to prospect for oil and will receive 75 per cent of the profits from the exploitation of any deposits discovered. The agreement also provides for sales points and filling-stations to distribute the fuel.

The operation undertaken by Signor Mattei caused an angry outburst on the part of the French oil trusts. *Le Monde* had had this to say: "M. Mattei's ENI will become firmly entrenched all along the route of the oil stream on the Tunisian territory which Italy has always regarded as its sphere of influence." Complaining that "the Sahara producers supply Tunisia with an oil pipeline, with an oil port, and pay her a part of the income in keeping with duly formulated agreements", where Signore Mattei "offers nothing but promises", *Le Monde* appealed to the "supreme judge". "There is no doubt," it wrote, "that Standard Oil will take all possible steps to compel the Tunisian authorities, if it is not too late, to relinquish its obligations."

This shows that both the overt colonisers and the neo-colonialists are pursuing purely imperialist aims. Each capitalist group is fighting for its own interests. And although the liberation movement of the Afro-Asian peoples impels the capitalists towards some kind of "solidarity", their motto, nevertheless, is: "Each for himself and . . . Africa for all."

Some Conclusions

The example of Tunisia makes it possible to draw a number of conclusions. *First*, it should be emphasised that the policy of neo-colonialism is inherent not only in countries without colonial possessions. Some sections of the big bourgeoisie in the metropolitan countries find it more advantageous to make certain concessions to the local bourgeoisie in order to maintain their economic position in the countries taking the road of political independence. This, for example, is what some representatives of the French big bourgeoisie are doing. The

older colonialists, however, are too much discredited to hope for success in their new role. So that compared with the imperialists who outwardly are less tarnished by colonial policy, they are at a disadvantage.

Second, the intrigues of the neo-colonialists are usually facilitated by the vacillations and inconsistencies of the ruling national bourgeoisie, in particular, their reluctance to complete the national-democratic revolution, and by their foreign policy. Thus, the absence of structural economic reforms in Tunisia is holding back the delivery of our economy from foreign capitalist domination. The pro-Western policy binds the country hand and foot, placing her at the mercy of the imperialist powers which, despite their antagonisms, display a certain "solidarity" dictated by their common interests on this issue.

Third, neo-colonialism encounters a series of growing contradictions which can be summed up as follows:

Contradictions between the neo-colonialists and the underdeveloped countries. The neo-colonialists aim at keeping within the capitalist system both the developed countries and those supplying cheap raw materials and importing manufactured goods. The neo-colonialists, on the pretext of granting aid, interfere in the latter's internal affairs, seeking to impose on them a definite economic and political course and to enmesh them in military alliances. But here they come up against the striving of the peoples for freedom, for the industrialisation and economic liberation which are essential in order to satisfy their needs and win complete independence. Even the national bourgeoisie which is in power, is, notwithstanding all its inconsistency, often forced to reject the conditions dictated by the neo-colonialists.

Precisely for this reason the Second Conference of the African Peoples held last January denounced the intrigues of the neo-colonialists and called for greater vigilance. It was for this reason that the Tunisian Government, taught by the experience of recent years and under pressure from the masses eager to get the answers to the urgent questions, has had to moderate its pro-Western orientation, and to express itself, though still in words, in favour of an "independent line" and co-operation with the socialist countries. The Minister of Finance, speaking in the National Assembly, said: "We have taken the way of fruitful economic co-operation with all countries regardless of whether they belong to the Western or Eastern bloc." Even President Bourguiba has been forced openly to criticise the U.S. aid. Replying to American journalists who asked him (March 22nd) whether he would accept Russian aid in the future, he said: "I shall accept any aid since the aid we receive at present is not enough, and the economic situation is deteriorating because of the growth of population."

To this we should add that the positions held by the neo-colonialists in Africa are being sapped by the Algerian war. This war has brought to light the collusion between the U.S., West German and other imperialists and the French imperialists.

Contradictions between capitalist groups of one and the same country. These contradictions are caused by conflicting interests which divide the big bourgeoisie into two main trends on the colonial question: some capitalists swear by the old, classical colonialism, others prefer neo-colonialism. This picture can be observed, for example, among the French bourgeoisie whose internal contradictions, conditioned by the war in Algeria, continue to grow as the war goes on. Some sections of the French bourgeoisie favour negotiations with the national forces in the colonies, while others insist on reprisals and colonial wars. The Congo events show that there are not a few supporters of undisguised violence among the colonialists.

The contradictions between the imperialist countries each of which is "tugging the blanket to itself" seeking to step into the shoes of the ousted or utterly discredited partner. Attempts to soften these contradictions have been unsuccessful. The matter was discussed at the economic conference of the Western countries held in Paris last January. This meeting formed a "group to promote development"; it included France, Britain, the United States, Western Germany, Italy, Japan, Canada, Belgium and Portugal. A meeting of the group, held behind closed doors in Washington, in addition to revealing numerous differences, failed to reach agreement.

The contradictions between the capitalist and socialist systems. It is common knowledge that neo-colonialism arose under the impact of the profound changes in the international situation caused by the rise and consolidation of the socialist system and the rapid growth of the national-liberation movement in the Afro-Asian countries. The decisive factors dooming neo-colonialism to a defeat are the existence of the socialist camp, the growing prestige of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries, and the influence exerted by them on the overall international situation.

Experience convinces the peoples of the underdeveloped countries, including the people of Tunisia, that they are now in a position to reject the conditions which the imperialists try to impose on them in the guise of aid. They see for themselves that they can get genuine and effective aid from the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries. What is more, the advanced people in these countries, attentively following the progress of the socialist camp, wholeheartedly welcome the advance of the Soviet Union and the strides made by the Chinese people in overcoming its economic backwardness. More and more they are being drawn to socialism, the system which guarantees rapid success.

• • •

Without underrating the danger emanating from the efforts of neo-colonialism to preserve foreign rule in the underdeveloped countries, and in Tunisia in particular, it can be said that there are favourable conditions for frustrating the latest designs of the imperialists, for promoting the advance of the peoples along the road of independence, progress and peace.

The Communist Party of Tunisia maintains that the best way for our country to avoid the dangers of neo-colonialism (as well as of the so-called classical colonialism) is resolute struggle for economic independence, for the fullest possible development of the national-democratic revolution.

Everything possible should be done to wrest the economy from the hands of the foreign monopolies. It is most essential to carry through far-reaching reforms, above all agrarian reform, in order to reconstruct the economy and to begin industrialisation.

Our Party is convinced that these aims will enhance the enthusiasm and release the initiative of the masses whose activity is the decisive factor in every anti-imperialist struggle. It should be added that the situation in the world today is such that every country, big or small, can stand up to the imperialist manoeuvres and intimidation. The example of Cuba and the entire process of African liberation show that this is perfectly feasible.

The people of Tunisia are becoming more and more convinced that success will not be found on the road of compromises with neo-colonialism but in persistent anti-imperialist struggle, in really consolidating our independence and, above all, our economic independence. This, says our Party, is the only acceptable perspective.

The struggle for Communism is the way to end the "Alienation" of Man.

ROGER GARAUDY

IN the debate on morality conducted in France and a number of other capitalist countries in recent years between Marxists and their ideological opponents, the problem of *"alienation"* has occupied an important place. The repeated attempts made by bourgeois philosophers (Sartre, Merleau-Ponty, Bigot, Rubel) and by revisionists such as Lefebvre and Fougeyrollas, to distort Marxism by juggling with the concept of "alienation" and attributing to it a metaphysical and idealistic meaning, oblige us to dwell for a moment on this concept. For a correct, materialistic and dialectical explanation of "alienation" should, in our view, play a big part in substantiating the proletarian, revolutionary, communist conception of morality.

1. What is the Marxist Concept of "Alienation"?

Marx's materialist interpretation of the concept of "alienation" in his early works makes it easier to understand the numerous vital processes taking place in the real life of society. A scientific theory of "alienation" and its sources helps to define man's specific place in Nature and the distinctive character of human history in relation to biological evolution.

Unlike animals who, in the course of their evolution, *adapt themselves* to Nature, man *changes* Nature. And it is with this change that his history begins. Man changes Nature in the process of labour. Man is the product of labour. The distinctive feature of the human being is that he remakes Nature in the course of social production aided by thinking. ". . . What distinguishes the worst architect from the best of bees," wrote Marx in *Capital*, "is this, that the architect raises his structure in imagination before he erects it in reality. At the end of every labour process, we get a result that already

existed in the imagination of the labourer at its commencement. He not only effects a change of form in the material on which he works but he also realises a purpose of his own that gives the law to his *modus operandi*. . . ." It is characteristic of human activity, then, that it pursues a conscious ultimate aim. Precisely for this reason human conduct has a definite meaning and purpose.

Contrary to the assertions of its critics, the materialist conception of history does not deny that social development has both meaning and purpose. But Marxism does not deduce history from these; on the contrary, it deduces them from history—in the final analysis from the actual movement of material production. In contrast to evolution in nature the development of society does not proceed of itself. As Engels noted "everything that sets men acting must find its way through their brains", and consequently social processes, once the necessary material conditions obtain, depend in large measure on the meaning people put into their actions and on the aims they pursue, that is, on the subjective factor. Needless to say, people do not determine this meaning or these aims arbitrarily; in the final analysis they are historically conditioned by economic development. "Hence," according to Marx, "mankind only sets itself such tasks as it can solve; since, looking at the matter more closely, we will always find that the task itself arises only when the material conditions for its solution are already present or are at least in the process of formation."

To perceive a definite meaning in man's activity, that is, not to rest content with *explaining* man as the product of a series of causes and, consequently, not to regard him as a thing, but to *understand* his aims, to discover the "meaning" of his behaviour—that is the basic principle of genuinely human relations, a moral obligation to regard man from the angle of his human essence, as one who works and makes things, that is to say, one who consciously sets himself aims in the process of his activity.

The primary source of "alienation" is the development of social production accompanied by a growing division of labour—separation of animal husbandry and later of handicrafts from crop growing, of mental from manual labour, and the subsequent specialisation of labour. In itself this process is progressive, for it increases the aggregate productive forces of society. With the appearance of private ownership of the means and instruments of production and the emergence of social classes, this process acquires an antagonistic character. Private ownership and the break-up of society into hostile classes lead to a situation in which the social division of labour "alienates" from the workers some of the vital functions inherent in man—intellectual activity, the freedom to dispose of the product of his labour, to have a say in the management of production, etc. These, becoming the special functions of certain privileged groups (officials, priests, owners of land and enterprises), are personified in the state, the market or the Church and, acquiring a certain measure of independence, confront the worker as an external and hostile force. In the soil of this alienation there germinates, in a class society, the peculiar ideology of "alienation"—religion, idealism, cult of the state, etc.

As the antagonistic society develops, and with the transition from one formation to another the alienation becomes less transparent. In slave-owning society the labour of the slave was estranged in the most primitive and brutal form together with his person; in feudal society labour was estranged chiefly in the form of rent (labour-rent, rent in kind and, later, money-rent); in capitalist society the labour of the worker is estranged in a concealed form, in the shape of surplus value.

In capitalist society the alienation of the worker is seen in its most complete form. Before capitalism, in natural economy, the article produced by the working man was, as a rule, the result of his personal effort alone and the worker had a fairly clear idea of the purpose and the use-value of his product, although he could not dispose of it freely. That was why even forced labour could not entirely kill the inspiration or joy of creation in the slave, the serf or the artisan: we still admire many of the works of art they produced. With the appearance of machines in capitalist society the worker is not only deprived of the right to dispose of his product; the very process of labour becomes for him less and less creative; the worker often loses all idea of the purpose or the use of the standard part he has made or of his personal role in creating use-value, for the final product has become absolutely impersonal.

Man is separated from the product of his labour: the object to which he has imparted life is not the product of his own mind, not a creation through which he changes Nature and humanises it; on the contrary, writes Marx in *Economic and Philosophic Manu-*

scripts of 1844, ". . . the object which labour produces—labour's product—confronts it as *something alien*, as a *power independent* of the producer". The worker loses conscious control over the object of his labour and realises the aims of other people—of those who own the means of production and hence the product of labour. That which the worker in a capitalist enterprise produces is not his own personal creation; he participates blindly in producing an anonymous commodity, in producing an equally anonymous surplus-value. He no longer sets aims; he becomes a means, like the means of production, a moment in the production process, just like the instruments of his labour. That is *the first aspect* of the "alienation" of the worker in capitalist society.

The second aspect is the alienation not only of the product but of the very process of labour: the labour of the worker becomes less and less an expression of his intrinsic need to create, to give free rein to his urge to do things, to his talent; because of the alienation of his aims, the labour of the worker becomes, increasingly, a matter of external compulsion. His actions and his behaviour are determined from without, by the place assigned to him in the complex system of social production and social relations, and are wholly predetermined by the methods of production. The worker in fact becomes a flesh and blood appendage to the machine.

Under capitalism, stresses Marx, labour "is therefore not the satisfaction of a need; it is merely a *means* to satisfy needs external to it." That which is truly human and creative in man—labour—is reduced under capitalism to a means of satisfying purely biological needs: ". . . estranged labour makes man's species life a means to his physical existence." That is *the third aspect* of estranged labour.

Estrangement of labour engenders all the other forms of alienation for it begets insincerity in the relations between people: subordinated to the spontaneous impersonal laws of the market in a society where the product of labour becomes a commodity, people become a means to an end for each other. Kant's "categorical imperative"—a call to regard man not only as a means to an end but above all as the end in itself—finds itself in conflict with the moral principles of capitalist society, for the victory of capitalism has rendered it patent that there is a yawning gulf between this inhuman world and the realm of aims which has no real basis under capitalism. In point of fact, the capitalist world is the diametrical opposite of the Kantian ideal. *Far from treating the worker as the end in itself, capitalism turns him into a mere means of creating surplus value and producing profits for the capitalist employer.*

When, for instance, a capitalist refuses to raise wages on the plea that he cannot add to the cost of production and raise the price of his goods without running the risk of closing down his enterprise, he is giving expression to the anonymous law which governs the capitalist system as a whole and which has nothing in common with human considerations. It would appear that the fatal necessity of impersonal things, of commodities and the relations that spring therefrom, rules people. Production costs, the market, value, competition—these are the deities, remote, alien and as inscrutable as fate, which dominate over men. These deities bear no relation to the needs of the working man, or to the personal virtues or vices of the employer. People, their actions, thoughts, and mutual relations become elements in the objective development of things. Relations between two people are replaced by relations between things.

The evolution of commodity society into its finished form—capitalism—gives rise to social relations from which man seems to be absent: alienated by inhuman *property* laws, he sheds a vital aspect of his human essence—that of consciously setting himself aims and of striving to realise them through labour.

This alienation, manifest in all spheres of the life of society, dehumanises man. In the sphere of economics it is the "fetishism of commodities" analysed by Marx in *Capital*. In politics it is the mystification of the bourgeois state, which is claimed to stand above classes—a mystification peculiar to the bourgeois mind. In the spiritual sphere the world, as Aragon has brilliantly shown is a world of "hommes doubles". Whereas thinking, by virtue of the very essence of man, is a process of continuous creation—the creation of cognised aims—thinking in an alienated world becomes an illusory compensation for the hostile reality that is slipping out of man's grip since the "mission" of this thinking is to transport people from the real world into the world of illusions (religion, the idealistic world outlook). The world of alienation is depicted as the real world while the world of reality is reduced to illusion.

Capitalism signifies the dominion of things over man; under capitalism the social and

personal relations between people are dominated by these things not only in their minds, but also in reality, all the way to everyday life. The warped outlook of the bourgeois is merely the ideological reflection of the actual state of affairs. In a milieu where everything is bought and sold the bourgeois marries not the woman but her dowry; friends are made for what can be got out of them; the thought of the legacy ousts love of parents; man is not respected for his personal qualities, but for his wealth or for the position he occupies; the bourgeois buys works of art, the latest automobile model, etc. not because he particularly needs them but in order to show "how many dollars he is worth". And what more striking confirmation could be had of this dominion of things over human sentiment than the exhibition of modern abstract art, the chunks of hardware, wire and rags which take the place of portrayal of human sentiment and actions?

The material and spiritual culture of man made immense progress under capitalism. But the motive behind the advance was not science, technology or art, but the thirst for profits. That is why most of the cultural achievements of capitalist society were attained *either in spite of the prevailing tendency of alienation*—as a protest against it in the form, for example, of literature and the art of critical realism—*or as its by-product*—such as scientific discovery and technical invention.

2. Historical Mission of the Working Class

To overcome alienation it is not enough to know it. The old world that engenders it must be changed and replaced by a new world free of the causes that give rise to it. It follows, then, that a condition for the *solution of the problem of alienation is working-class struggle in capitalist society.*

In contrast to any other class in capitalist society *the proletariat,* to use the expression of Marx, *is the only class which speaks on behalf of mankind,* inasmuch as under capitalism the proletariat is stripped of everything but the most profound essence of man, labour as such, and personifies this essence of man.

Hence the proletariat differs radically from all other classes. The needs of the poor peasant, the petty artisan or the shopkeeper, worse off than the skilled worker though these may be, are usually associated with the means of production which they possess—a plot of land, implements or a shop—and which, on the other hand, possess them. Their needs have been imposed upon them from "outside", by external circumstances. The peasant, the artisan and the shopkeeper have been, as it were, replaced and alienated by their own property and experience all the ups and downs that come their way as property-owners. Their behaviour is, to a degree, determined by this "property", whereas the proletariat's struggle is subordinate to no particular interest, and is simply a condition of its existence. The proletariat can earn a livelihood only by selling its labour power to the owner of the means of production; all its hopes of existence are contained in class struggle against the big owners of the means of production, against capital.

Despite the day-to-day efforts made by the workers to sell their labour power on more favourable terms and the temporary gains won in this struggle, the operation of the law of absolute impoverishment deprives the proletariat of the means of leading a truly human life in the sense historically determined by the progress of technology, economy, science, culture and morality. Man has now registered his first successes in the conquest of outer space, the alchemists' dreams of transmuting elements are coming true, and the earth's inexhaustible material wealth is being opened up, yet one man in three in this world is permanently undernourished and hundreds of millions are illiterate. *The absolute impoverishment of the working class signifies that there is a widening gap between the historically determined needs of the working man and the means at his disposal for satisfying them.*

Man cannot become man unless he destroys the iron laws of things that dominate him under capitalism. That is the philosophical significance of the proletariat's revolutionary demands. For the worker the desire to live, to live a human life, means abolishing the social system in which private ownership of the means of production prevails together with the law of impoverishment, which dehumanises and degrades him. If a worker is to live decently he must fight for a social system based on public ownership of the means and instruments of production. And although in one or another country a considerable number of workers may still have no clear conception of this perspective, or of the historical mission of their class, yet any claim advanced by them, or any strike they fight, no matter how small, their struggle for the right to live—all jeopardise the

capitalist system as a whole. The genius of Marx was that he discovered the historical importance and the significance to all mankind of the working-class struggle.

The historical mission of the proletariat became possible when, with capitalism in the saddle, "alienation" became universal and created the objective conditions for its own negation. For as the concentration of production and property grows, the development of capitalism is accompanied by the wholesale ruin of small owners and the progressive self-estrangement of large owners from any socially useful function in production. More and more capitalism is personified not in individual employers, but in anonymous firms, joint stock companies and corporations, and of course in the bourgeois state which, under modern state-monopoly capitalism, becomes the owner of nationalised enterprises and re-allocates through the budget a considerable part of the national income in favour of the monopoly groupings who control the state apparatus. Having long since ceased to fulfil socially necessary functions, the capitalists are a parasitical class that is superfluous in social reproduction. This fact offers further evidence that socialisation of the means and instruments of production, their transfer to ownership by the people, is a historical necessity.

At the same time we see the growth in capitalist society of the social forces capable of putting an end to the alienation of the working man. And the working-class emancipation movement develops out of the separate protests, out of the spontaneous revolt of the masses in all spheres of social life; the purpose of this movement is the moral regeneration of mankind and civilisation, to restore to the worker the fruits of his labour and the joy of creation, the freedom to develop his abilities and the right to order his own life, that is, to restore to man the qualities alienated from him by an antagonistic social system. Thanks to the struggle waged by the working class and the other progressive forces against capitalist oppression, alienation can never become absolute, just as, notwithstanding the concentration of property, Kautsky's "ultra-imperialism" headed by a single capitalist will never appear. To the trend towards alienation the working class opposes its class solidarity, discipline and organisation. The heroism and selflessness displayed in the class struggle regenerates the working class spiritually, while the socialist ideology enables it to break away from the narrow confines of capitalist alienation, to become conscious of its fundamental interests and to see the prospects of social development. Through the medium of its emancipation struggle the working class draws the other exploited sections of the population into the struggle, engenders creative thought in the intellectuals and lays the moral foundations of the new society.

Private ownership of the means of production inevitably engenders alienation, while the socialisation of the means of production, that is, the destruction of the economic basis of alienation, will signify the genuine regeneration of the working man. In *Capital* Marx defines the economic basis of this concrete humanism: Communism, he writes, is ". . . a community of free individuals, carrying on their work with the same means of production in common, in which the labour power of all the different individuals is consciously applied as the combined labour power of the community." The fundamental meaning and basic purpose of human existence will triumph, liberated, creative and conscious labour will become a reality in communist society, that stage in its development when mankind no longer bears the slightest resemblance either materially or spiritually to what it was when it first appeared.

It is not a question of reverting to the idea of recreating eternal "human nature" as Feuerbach metaphysically conceived it, nor is it a matter of resurrecting the myth of Rousseau's "bon sauvage". Marxists do not sigh for a return to some "golden age". The concrete moulding of the "integral man" does not imply a return to primitive times, but, on the contrary, assimilation of the technological and scientific achievemnts, of the material and spiritual wealth of civilisation, of the culture, of the human efforts of the past, of which the results will be multiplied under communism by the new strength of the collective.

In socialist society the economic basis of all alienation—private ownership of the means of production—is destroyed. The abolition of the antithesis between town and countryside, and between mental and manual labour, and the subsequent obliteration of the distinction between them will lead to the regeneration of the integral man who, under communism, will labour not under the compulsion of external necessity, but because of intrinsic need, who will not be condemned to stick to any one job throughout

his life and who will have the leisure and the means for all-round physical and spiritual development.

Having discovered the law of the development of capitalist society and its inner dialectics, Marx showed that only through the working-class struggle can mankind end the alienation of the working man. *Hence the primary requirement of Marxist morality is wholehearted participation in the struggle of the proletariat, whose class aims are in keeping with the liberation of all the oppressed and man's emancipation from the fetters of "alienation" in all its forms.*

3. The Moral Ideal of the Working Class

What is it that gives the working class its moral supremacy over the bourgeoisie?

If, as Kautsky claimed in his *Ethics and the Materialist Conception of History* (1906), it were merely a question of registering the existence of class antagonisms and of foreseeing the direction in which the conflict of forces would resolve itself, of establishing that owing to the internal contradictions of capitalism, the ultimate victory of the working class is assured, then to enlist because of these considerations in the camp of the assured victors would not in itself be sufficient to justify the moral value of the choice. That would be the morality of a Talleyrand or a Fouché, not of Babeuf and Varlin. Furthermore, this would mean acting from the purely external necessity inherent in an alienated world where man is but a link in the chain of things and events, and where human history is identified with the history of Nature.

Our conviction that socialism will inevitably triumph is of a more profound nature: it is not a matter of the *external* necessity governing the development of a system hostile to man, but of an *intrinsic* necessity, implying the active and conscious activity of man. The abyss between the two is one between mechanical evolution and dialectical progress. One takes place without me, the other requires my participation.

Purely external necessity outlines the prospects of development, but gives no choice. The necessity that drives the worker to struggle against the capitalist system is not perceived by him passively, as the inertia of history. This is not the necessity of animal instinct, nor of spontaneity: spontaneity is the passive reflection of a situation; hence it can lead either to simple adaptation to the given social system or to blind revolt.

How is the transition from external necessity to intrinsic necessity effected? Under the first, man is wholly estranged, subordinated to things, while under the second history is subordinated to the conscious ultimate aim of man. These are two extremes. In reality there are multiple degrees of consciousness and responsibility between them, that is, numerous forms of man's intervention in the march of history, from the capitalist jungle described by Marx, where human aims are mutually nullified, to the classless, communist society developing according to a conscious plan thanks to the combined efforts of all. In the transition from one stage to another, the role of the subjective factor—of consciousness—grows steadily. Man, at first the passive *object* of history, changes, under socialism, into the active *subject* of history. In the first case he is a passive thing, in the second he embarks upon truly human activity fully aware of what he is doing.

How is this transition in the consciousness of the working class effected? The aims pursued by this class flow from its place in history, as is the case with other classes. Working-class consciousness passes through various stages of development. It can be, for example, the passive reflection of an immediate objective situation. A working man, having accepted the prevailing ideas in capitalist society, the ideas, as Marx pointed out, of the dominant exploiting class, may, in the desire to feather his own nest, act as a spy for his boss, try to "get on in the world", take the path of class collaboration, or he may simply resign himself to his lot as something ordained from on high. These are all variations of adaptation to the surrounding world, to the capitalist system under which there are various kinds of ideological justification for such conduct.

The consciousness of the oppressed class can react also in another way—not by adapting itself passively to the existing situation but by doing something to change society. And here, again, there are a number of stages. In *The Condition of the Working Class in England*, Engels traces the first stages of this revolt—from actions against private property and the destruction of machines to strikes and trade union activity. An objective change in the condition of the working people plays an important part in the transition from spontaneous revolt to organised forms of the class struggle. Concen-

tration of industry creates objective conditions by virtue of which the workers become conscious of their class solidarity. But this consciousness still does not go beyond the limits of day-to-day experience. And if no attempt is made to proceed beyond the bounds of direct employer-worker relations, it will be impossible to rise above economic struggle, purely trade union activity and a corresponding trade union mentality limited by economic interests (V. I. Lenin, *What Is To Be Done?*).

Lenin showed that for the transition from spontaneous revolt or economic struggle for better terms for the sale of labour power to truly revolutionary (political) struggle, the working class must transcend this immediate experience. Revolutionary consciousness, which sets the working class the objective of establishing a social system under which labour power will no longer be sold like a commodity, does not develop from limited economic struggle between workers and employers. Revolutionary consciousness must be brought into the proletariat's class struggle by theoreticians who have adopted the standpoint of the working class, for it implies knowledge of the history of society. And this imparts its true meaning to the modern working-class struggle, makes the proletariat the heir and continuer of man's past history and opens up to him the prospect of a classless society, a society in which there will be no alienation, a society in which relations between people will be truly human. In relation to the working class, the task of inculcating the new morality is fulfilled by the Communist Party, which teaches it scientific socialism.

This morality does not fall from the skies. It is both the reflection and the realisation of the immediate reality, as well as the generalisation of human history as a whole: from the appearance of man to a classless, communist society in which history will be a record of man's development according to a conscious plan.

The ideology of all other classes has been limited and contradictory; reflecting the historical conditions, it has justified alienation. Scientific socialism is an ideology differing from all others, for it came into being at a time when, under capitalism, alienation acquired a universal character, and hence, the class that is digging the grave for capitalism for the first time in history obtains the opportunity to abolish alienation.

The most deep-going historical necessity is that which arises from the inner dialectics of the development of society and is realised through the working-class struggle. *It is precisely for this reason that in the objective ultimate aim, the way to which is illumined by the Marxist-Leninist science, each can see his deepest personal aspirations, which fully harmonise with the desire to fulfil one's duty to mankind. Only by regarding the aims of the working class as one's personal aims, and only by taking the standpoint of the working class and wholeheartedly participating in its struggle can one work effectively for man's future.*

The fusing of the working-class movement and scientific socialism was a big leap forward in the history of morality. From the moment when the working class, upon becoming conscious of its historical mission, changes from "a class in itself" into a "class for itself", history ceases to be the spontaneous interweaving of cause and effect. It becomes more and more the conscious affair of man, a record of the realisation of his plans and his calling.

The moral superiority of the working class derives not from the fact that in the historical clash between the classes in modern society the proletariat will inevitably triumph, but from the fact that it regenerates mankind, paves the way to the social system which embodies the thousand years' struggle against all forms of alienation and ensures the flowering of the personality.

Human morality is placed upon a sound scientific basis. Realisation of the rational essence of human history comprises an integral whole with the act through which the problem of translating this rational essence into reality is solved, with the will to subordinate history to man's ultimate aim and to put some part of one's effort into man's conscious translation into life of the real purpose of his existence. The historical mission of the working class is to regenerate the integral man in a free society.

The party which reveals the meaning of history to the working class, that shows the perspective and the ways of establishing a new, socialist society, is the herald of genuine human freedom. This freedom is not something arbitrary, it does not appear from *nothing* as does the freedom of the existentialists, Sartre for example. On the contrary, it springs from real social *being*, or rather it is the creative and conscious flowering of this being. For man is not merely his past; in still greater measure, he is his

future. Man embodies the creative effort directed towards solving the contradictions in modern life wholly and finally. Only by having a scientific knowledge of these objective contradictions and by actively participating in the historical battle of the working class will it be possible to solve these contradictions. Freedom is not the arbitrariness of human personality, it is the creative participation of personality in the objective dialectics of historical necessity.

Marxist morality fully reveals to man all his powers and responsibilities of which the various forms of alienation have deprived him. "Man must be made to understand," said Maxim Gorky, "that he is both creator and master of the world; that on him rests the responsibility for all that is evil in the world, and that to him belongs also the glory for all that is good in life!"

Since the day these words were spoken more than one-third of mankind have won freedom from the rule of the spontaneous laws of an antagonistic society, laws which engender the alienation of man. The new social system which has triumphed in a considerable part of the world is changing man morally, giving expression to his finest spiritual and physical qualities. Socialism has led to the establishment of genuinely human relations between people who, having taken their destiny into their own hands, and sensible of their own responsibility before history and the generations to come, are paving man's way to the communist tomorrow.

The Wealth of Life — the Wealth of Art

A. OBRETENOV

"In Maracaibo, the oil workers subjected to brutal exploitation pump out from the bowels of the earth oceans of oil for the omnipotent monopolies; in Central America, the pickers of tropical fruit live in a hell; in Peru, the gentle Incas, deceived and plundered, are doomed to extinction; in Buenos Aires, this new Chicago where as in a fermentation vat all the antagonisms of capitalism are merged together, thousands are on strike; in Lota, in the south of Chile, thousands of miners working deep in the coal mines, the galleries of which lie under the sea, live in ignorance and are deprived of all rights.

"These are the things that should have been the material for our work. The world with all its beauty, suffering and struggle lay before us, the writers. We should have defined our attitude to this hitherto neglected reality. But we acted merely as writers, whereas we should have acted as people."

In these words the national poet of Chile, Pablo Neruda, talks about the new attitude which can be observed among Chilean, and not only Chilean, writers.

Everywhere writers and artists are striving to penetrate deeper into life, to reproduce a true picture of it, to leave to future generations a vivid and moving picture of our epoch.

Large numbers of writers and artists are busy in all countries, both socialist and capitalist. Differing from one another in temperament and style, in their way of depicting the world, they are united by their ideology and by the desire to further the cause of the working class and the people as a whole. They join forces with the fighters for socialism.

Life has confronted our epoch with the task—to build the new, free world of communism in the place of the old world of exploitation. The hero, of whom Pablo Neruda speaks, the man with the new world outlook, should be portrayed in literature and art.

Maxim Gorky was a brilliant representative of socialist art. The works of numerous writers show how this art is gaining a firm foothold in country after country. Historically speaking, socialist art is quite young. Rich with experience it is advancing boldly in some countries, making initial success in others, and in still others it has yet to make an appearance. The growth of socialist art, naturally, is not without its errors, weaknesses and contradictions. The anti-socialists often seize on these weaknesses in order to blacken the principles of this art. But none criticises his mistakes so severely and in such a principled way as the representatives of this art, whose sole purpose is to make it more vivid and effective.

Socialist art is developing alongside the various trends in art, intertwining and merging with some of them, and often engaging in a dialogue with them. It stands for friendly co-operation with all that is sincere and forward-looking, retaining, naturally, its own specific

features. If we turn to the best works of socialist art it will become clear that this new trend has accumulated such stores of ideological and aesthetic wealth that it has won its place in the history of art as a developing trend, as *a new stage* in man's artistic progress.

Today, no one can deny the innovating significance of the writing of Gorky, Mayakovsky, Sholokhov, Aragon, Brecht and many others. Take, for example, Aragon's *The Communists*. This book carries forward the progressive traditions of French and world realism. But, being a product of the new times, it mirrors life at the stage when the new forces, striving towards socialism, are growing stronger. Aragon is of the opinion that socialist realism can appear not only in a socialist country, because it is a way of writing associated with the attitude adopted by the writer, with his acceptance of the ideology of the revolutionary class and his ability to see the horizons of socialism.

In *The Communists* there is a scene depicting the town during an air raid. People run hither and thither, jostling each other and seeking shelter; frightened horses neigh, rear up and overturn the cart. . . . The tinkle of the shattered glass . . . the explosions, and the victims. . . . The evocation resembles Picasso's "Guernica". But this is not Guernica, it is France plunged into the chaos of war and defeat. And in this chaos, in this inferno, the Communist Raoul Blanchard pushes on in his car doggedly and persistently. Death trails him. Buildings are crashing and tumbling all around him. Tenaciously he forges ahead and, at last, reaches the broad highway.

The picture, a realistic one, is stamped in our memory, it is a symbolic portrayal of the France of those days. The old bourgeois France is tottering. But out of her depths comes the Communist Party, reinforced and reinvigorated at the cost of countless victims. It has absorbed all that is best in the people and is the embodiment of their hopes.

In this profound insight lies the ideological impact and inspiring optimism of this brilliant piece of socialist realism.

Critics of socialist realism often censure it for its optimism. In their view the socialist writer is something like the "Man Who Laughs", a man with a forced smile on his face. They deny that the optimism of the writer or artist is determined by the logic of life, by the laws of social development. Aragon's epic is a striking expression of this objective dynamics of history. Everything is in motion, both the events and the characters. In masterly fashion the writer shows how the thought throbs and vibrates in thousands of minds, how truth is born out of chaos; and that which was but a faint glimmer in the subconscious grows, under the impact of tempestuous events, into a solid conviction. In the minds of the people the patriotic idea of saving France intertwines more and more with the socialist idea of emancipating the country from capitalism.

Aragon shows how people come to communism. Some travel a straight road, inspired by the everyday struggle of the working class; others—intellectuals and those who previously were opposed to communism—find the way with great difficulty.

Writers have always been attracted by the contradictions between the individual and society. In our times this problem has been solved, with tens and hundreds of millions taking action to resolve the issues agitating mankind. The purely "personal" ceases to be something narrow and restricted; it is infused with new social content. Socialist realism correctly reflects the new in life, and this imparts strength to it.

Joseph, the Paris worker, one-armed and blind, is in hospital. He feels that all is lost. He is visited by Cécile Wisner, who tells him that she is looking after the children of a woman Communist who has been arrested. You took them in, queries Joseph, because she was a Communist? Yes, replies Cécile, and Joseph, blind and crippled though he is, sheds his despondency. For who was it that had told Cécile about communism, about the Party? It was he who had directed her along this path, and now her heart beats in unison with the hearts of his friends, beats for those who are in prison, for those working in the underground, for those who risk their lives.

This humanist understanding of the individual is the supreme manifestation of spiritual freedom not only of the hero but of the writer himself. It signifies emancipation from narrow-mindedness, the freedom of the spirit springing from a profound knowledge of historical necessity, from man's understanding of his role in social life. This is the opposite of egotistic individualism.

Comprehension of the essence of the historical processes, the driving forces of the development of society and the individual, ensures to socialist realism genuine freedom in its portrayal of life. Its ideological appeal lies in revealing the truth of life, in assessing social phenomena from the standpoint of progress and the lofty ideals of humanity, that

is, from the standpoint of the Party, and least of all in preaching and abstractions. The strength of socialist realism lies in its truth.

Socialist art comes under heavy fire from the anti-socialists, and this is not accidental. Our opponents distort the very essence of socialist realism—fidelity to life, concreteness, partisanship and humanism. The representatives of socialist art uphold the great traditions of realism. In this struggle the realists all over the world are allies of all progressive artists.

• • •

Socialist realism depicts life not in some kind of eternal "abstract" manifestations of it, but in its evolution, in the combination of historically specific phenomena. Deeply rooted in the life of the people, it reflects the national features of the country and its people.

The writer of these lines has visited not a few art exhibitions of the formalists. At such exhibitions one gets the impression that he is in a kind of "no-man's-land" outside time and space. This art has nothing whatever to say about its country. In our view the formalistic idea of a universal art, common to all and minus national flavour, is futile and senseless.

By its very nature realism reflects the truth of life, develops in the artist the ability to feel the pulse of life, the spirit of his people. The national feelings of the artist expressed in his attitude to life are patterned by the experience of his people, by the traditions on which he has been brought up. The national quality is something more than the particular style of the artist, something more than "local colour".

In the contemporary art of every nation we find revolutionary pen and ink drawing. But how this drawing differs in each country! What a difference in choice of subject, in ideological and artistic treatment and in plastic expression! The art of every country continues and develops the national traditions: Mexican art continues the work of the Mayas and Aztecs, Chinese art is the successor to the "Kuohua" and the folk drawings, while German art has its own classical and revolutionary past. The traditions, the conditions of everyday life, the tasks facing the nation, and the talent of the artist—all leave their imprint.

Mexican artists portray the oppression and suffering of the people, their protest and fight for freedom. They like sharp contrast and artistic exaggeration; they stress the social contradictions, heightening the tension and dramatising it. To intensify the impression they often resort to allegories and symbolic generalisations. One has the feeling that instead of telling a story they are intent on delivering a blow; sometimes external verisimilitude and harmony are sacrificed for the sake of more vivid portrayal. Their portrayal is razor-edged in its sharpness, grim and often grotesque.

While developing the best features of the national tradition, Chinese artists also use the experience of European realists. Discarding the obsolete in the art legacy and cultivating everything positive and forward-looking, Chinese art is acquiring a new content. But does this obliterate the difference between Chinese art and the art of other nations? Chinese works are distinguished for their remarkable love of nature, their attention to the image of the people, the harmony of form, the skill in drawing lines, in the use of detail to heighten the emotion.

We know German painters with their expressive portrayal. Their appeal is not simply to the emotion but above all to the mind, the will, and the public conscience. And we distinguish these artists from, say, the Rumanian pen and ink artists with their lyricism, sincerity and romanticism.

In every national art kindred things, ideas and feelings are interpreted in their own way and given a specific colouring, depending on the complex of historical, philosophical, ethical, aesthetic and other concepts of the nation and its artistic traditions.

Everyday life offers a variety of subjects, ideas and feelings common to all artists. But it engenders also distinctions in the national character and psychology, in culture and art. Socialism clears the way for the free development of the best forms of the national art.

At last year's exhibition of the art of the socialist countries in Moscow, we Bulgarian art workers saw that notwithstanding the weaknesses (which are not few) our art, represented by the works of our best artists, also contributed to the diversity of forms of socialist art. Visitors and critics noted that the works of Dimitrov-Maistor, Venev and Petrov, Bulgarian landscape painters and pen and ink artists, bear the hallmark of our country, its bright sunlight, the history of our nation and its life. This national quality was more pronounced at this year's art exhibition in Sofia devoted to the fifteenth anniversary of the liberation of Bulgaria. It was justly noted that our art had drawn closer to the people and reflected more fully the various aspects of their life. The better the artists are acquainted with the everyday

life of the working people, the more vividly the labour, aspirations and ideals of the people are embodied in their works, the clearer the national melodies sound in them.

• • •

Life unfolds itself in the most varied aspects. The quiet, unruffled march of history gives way to tempestuous, kaleidoscopic events, the tragic alternates with the comic. One and the same phenomenon, seen in its association with other things, gives the impression of different colours. The diversity of the world is infinite; it cannot be encompassed by one style, by one particular approach.

Our opponents say that unity of artistic method signifies a levelling, standardisation. But Byron, Hugo and the young Pushkin were romantics. Did their romanticism unify their specific artistic qualities? Balzac, Dickens and Tolstoy were realists. But did this prevent each of them from writing in his own particular way? So how can we believe those who glibly assert that a common creative method kills originality and produces monotony? No, the unity of the method of socialist realism presupposes a diversity of individual styles and devices.

Realism provides ample opportunity for the diversity in styles because it insists on writers and artists reflecting life in all its richness, on their giving a broad picture of life in all its manifold aspects, manifestations and tendencies—from the complex social relationships to the personal experiences of man, from the beautiful and the lofty to the shameful and evil.

Truth can be expressed in many ways. Hence it is "not the concept of narrowness but the concept of breadth that fits realism . . . ", wrote Bertolt Brecht. "When we see the variety of forms in which life can be described it dawns on us that realism, generally speaking, is not just a question of form. . . . It would be extremely dangerous if the grand concept of 'realism' were to become the monopoly of a handful of names no matter how famous, and to turn a few styles into a single possible method." Sholokhov, Alexei Tolstoy, Brecht, Tvardovsky and Pablo Neruda are exponents of socialist realism. But how different are their works in style, individual approach and means of expression. Sholokhov has given us a broad epic canvas devoted to the great moments in the life of his country and, simultaneously, to the decisive moments in the destiny of his characters who are drawn from the people.

Only the blind would fail to see the striking quality of such a representative of socialist art as Bertolt Brecht. Brecht's passionate denunciation of capitalism, his bold challenge to and his biting satire on the capitalist world are expressed in a peerless artistic form. In creative work, said Brecht, feeling subjects the mind to severe strain, and the mind refines the feeling. In Brecht calm reasoning is succeeded by a paradox, by an aphorism and sometimes by an allegory, while the realistic portrayal alternates with fantasy and most unexpected turns of thought.

Tvardovsky's poem *The Distance and Beyond* and Pablo Neruda's *Universal Song* telling of the life of the different peoples, are imbued with socialist ideas. But it is impossible not to see the difference between the natural, colloquial, melodic verse of Tvardovsky with its classical rhythm and simplicity of lyrical narration and the verse of Neruda with its dynamic rhythm, unusual images, counterposing outwardly unrelated things, which are the charm of the poem.

When the diversity of life is reflected in striking individualities we get that richness which is the hallmark of an art blossoming in all its glory.

In socialist art, which is alien to narrowness and dogmatic restriction, we see all forms and genres, from the multi-figure composition to the still-life, from the monument to the medallion, from the pathetic drama to the lyrical landscape, from the elevated ode to the annihilating satire. The arsenal is inexhaustible. Most important and fruitful is the fusion of realism with romanticism, when the latter becomes a component of socialist realism. The everyday life of the socialist world often surpasses even the most fantastic dreams. This life is permeated with the spirit of romanticism. To depict life realistically means to depict it in its development, to show the realisation of man's revolutionary ideals. The hum-drum is now inseparable from the romantic impulse.

Genuine art does not copy life in a pale, bloodless way, like a bad photograph. The artist interprets the facts of life, emphasises, generalises and utilises the features of the particular form of art and gives free rein to his fantasy. Sometimes he concentrates on the unusual, on exceptional, fantastic and even incredible circumstances and, by doing so, reproduces the profoundly typical features of reality. In the multiform socialist art romanticism, the grotesque and conventionality are not counterposed to realism, they are its special forms. By means

of the creative method, which insists on truthful portrayal, one and the same thing can be expressed differently.

The death of friends brought a sense of inconsolable loss to three poets, each of whom expressed his grief in song. But how different in style are these songs!

W. Broniewski, a Polish poet, conveys a realistic picture of a tragic event and places it in its historical context:

> They were but fifty,
> Brave young lads
> Who had left their workshops,
> And picked up stones from the road,
> To do battle for the people,
> For our happiness and freedom.
> They were but fifty,
> But we became a hundred times stronger.
>
> (*Ballad of the Fifty*)

Paul Eluard does not offer us visible plastic characters. He neither describes nor explains; all he does is to place the name of his hero in a complex chain of words expressing that which is bright, pure, dear and near to everyone, and suddenly the name becomes a link in the chain, a particle of our life:

> Are there not words, are there not names
> Which always inspire life,
> The words Love, Faith, Warmth,
> Liberty, Justice,
> Honour, Child,
> The names of flowers or of fruit.
> There is the word Courage, the word Discover,
> There is the word Brother and alongside it Comrade.
> And to the names of friends and women dear
> We add the name Gabriel Peri,
> Peri, who died that we should live.

The Soviet poet, Samed Vurgun, has also provided us with a romantic picture in which all nature, the steppe and the breeze become living things; the characters and the action, seemingly, are detached from the events:

> The hero is elated, mighty
> He cleaved the heavens with his thought
> The gaze is burning with inextinguishable flame
> And steel hearts beat in the breast. . . .
> Your hearts have not ceased to beat!
>
> (*The Twenty-Six*)

The art of socialist realism is an infinite variety of individualities: Becher and Vaptsarov, Prokofiev and Shostakovich, Johanson, Rivera, Guttuso, Nezval and Hikmet. . . . The wealth of individualities and the quality of their talents explain the variety of style and approach. But the ultimate source of each is embedded in the diversity of everyday life.

The criterion of the originality and quality of an artist is objective; it is the degree to which he penetrates into life, the breadth and versatility of his portrayal of the world. Genuine originality is above all the striving for truthful portrayal, for the wealth of life, and not subjective emphasis on the individuality of the artist and his style. Justification of subjectivism in the guise of creative freedom and the eclectic desire to "accept" formalistic stunts are alien to socialist art. Equally alien is the dogmatism which insists on a particular style, on rigid adherence to abstract criteria, which imprison the imagination and restrict the striving for breadth and innovation.

Some critics of socialist realism claim that it pins the artist to earth, fetters him to politics, to facts, and deprives him of freedom to write as he pleases. The writer, they say, can obtain genuine freedom only by ending his dependence on "matter", on concrete phenomena. But this kind of "freedom" brings but poor results. The American critic O'Hara assured us, for instance, that the sculptor Lipton became known in the United States only when he discovered that the material and social themes which he had chosen restricted his freedom of creation. Lipton came in for praise from O'Hara after casting spirals and other metal

figures in which he is said to have achieved a "controlled organic dynamism". Venturi, an Italian critic, lauded the artist Scialoja for "breaking with prejudices of a social, literary and philosophical character and turning to painting", that is, to painting "pictures" of the type of the "white background"—an oblong canvas with shapeless blots: bright on the left side, dark on the right. But a glance at the works of Lipton and Scialoja suffices to show that this chaotic piling up of geometric or colour blots has neither artistic taste, lofty feeling, nor sense. Such, then, is the "freedom" for which some artists neglect the social problems of their day and refuse to portray man and his spiritual world.

The theoreticians of modern abstract art attack realism which, they say, burdens art with the concreteness of the real world and thereby restricts its freedom. Above all they attack the concept of image expression. And this is understandable because by its very nature the image should reflect real life. Those artists-who-talk-to-themselves argue that the image is alien to art, saying that its element is not the external world, but the soul of the artist, his inner life. But the subjective world of the artist, being part of reality, can be expressed only in concrete manifestations. On the stage the actor can act the part of the man driven frantic with grief, but should he fail to find the appropriate words, actions and gestures his grief will not touch the audience. To deny the artistic image is the same as saying reality does not exist.

Everybody knows where this modernist "emancipation" from concreteness of the world leads to. Here is how some Yugoslav modernists depict that which of all things is the most expressive and beautiful—the human face. Ljubo Ivancic depicts it as oblong, something like a dehydrated carrot with strangely located holes supposed to be eyes, with half a mouth and a saucer-like nose. His modernist colleague Mario Mascarelli depicts the face as a floating horizontal ellipsis with two circles for eyes. Albert Kinert places the eyes on the forehead and attributes to the ear an even more eccentric shape. Sava Vujovif paints his daughter both in full face and in profile, with the profile attached to another portrait, apparently that of a man. But this is nothing compared to the "originality" of Ferdinand Kulmer whose network of straight and crooked lines is supposed to be a "head". And this, we are told, is the new art! But the test of innovation is not extravaganza in distorting life, but in the really new things the artist says about man, the heights reached by man in his everyday activity, the new ways of depicting human life and character. Innovation is something more than flashy painting, it is a profoundly humanist category which elevates rather than lowers man.

The attitude of our artists to formalism is determined not by abstract needs or subjective tastes. It would be wrong to reject the search for new means of expression. On the contrary, we are interested in enriching the potential of the artist. The content of art is constantly renewed and replenished, and new content necessitates new forms. But we do not agree with formalism, and even less with abstract art, because it substitutes subjectivist fantasy for reality, distorts life, waters down art, deprives it of objective content—and this, logically, has its effect on form.

The exhibition of socialist art held last year in Moscow was organised by twelve countries, each with its own art experience, its own way of development, national traditions and craftsmanship. The artists themselves pointed to the inadequacies of some works: a photographic reproduction of an idea, insufficient utilisation of the positive experience, etc. But the fundamental features of socialist art stand out clearly. This art concentrates attention on man, not on man in the abstract but on man as he really is. It is an art that fights for lofty social ideals; it is humane and democratic in the best sense of the word. It seeks to show the life of man and society in motion, in revolutionary development, in all its diversity. Despite its shortcomings, the Moscow exhibition had much to say about the life of the people and their countries. Reflecting life in its development, socialist art itself changes, acquires new forms, broadens its horizons and perfects its methods. A tendency towards the constant enrichment and diversity of subjects, ideological content, the emotional streams, the forms and the individual style of the artist, is inherent in socialist realism.

• • •

The fate of every trend in art is decided ultimately by its ability to paint a true picture of life, furnish the answers to the questions posed by life and to influence life.

De Santis, one of the representatives of Italian neo-realism, has said: "Not by a long way do our films fully reflect Italian life. Too much attention is given to particulars. The struggle waged by the working class is not reflected, and without this there can be no genuine realism."

Neo-realism has achievements to its credit, especially in cinematography. We have seen excellent pictures of the life of ordinary man battling for his place in the world, pictures which show the nobility and courage of the Italian people. The best works of neo-realism are imbued with the spirit of criticism of the property-owning society, with faith in man.

Of late, however, some of the neo-realists, as Italian art workers acknowledge, evading the great issues of the day, have turned to minor themes with a resultant restriction of horizons. Italian progressives (and not only Italian, because most people are interested in neo-realism) have evinced concern over these weaknesses, being anxious to preserve and multiply the forces of the realists.

The striving to find the answers to the issues of the day is to be commended. We have in mind also the numerous non-realist artists many of whom have a strong social sense and loathe the evil and brutality of the capitalist world. These people are searching for a way out. For some of them futurism, surrealism and abstractionism are a kind of revolt against capitalist society. Other artists are dissatisfied with naturalism which palms itself off as realism. Some go too far, exaggerating the role of the subject and proclaiming complete "freedom", implying by this independence of the artist from objective reality and unrestricted subjective arbitrariness. Others, in search of new artistic forms, contract "leftism", an infantile disorder in art, regarding innovation as a complete break with all tradition. We should be tactful and flexible in relation to those searching for new means of expression. They should not be alienated. On the contrary, we should help them shed their wrong views by explaining our principles and engaging in comradely argument.

The stronger the social sense of the artist, the greater his doubt in the success of an individual protest. Many writers and artists are aware that an excessive subjectivism constricts their humanist ideas into a narrow circle, prevents them from joining up with the other forces in society. Obeying the call of their conscience, many outstanding writers and artists in all countries, beginning with Mayakovsky, joined the wide stream of socialist art, displaying their talents, shelving the petty and the casual and finding fresh opportunities for creative work.

The idea of life, the desire to serve people unites the progressive artists everywhere. Art, said D. Blagoyev, founder of the Bulgarian Communist Party, is a powerful means of self-knowledge and of educating the people. The Communists cannot be indifferent to art and with whom it sides in a world rent by contradictions; their job is to ensure the fusion of art with the life of the working people.

The people respect their art workers; they welcome the appearance of every book, film and painting which draws its inspiration from life, expresses the truth of life and serves the happiness of man. This is a source of joy to the artist and, simultaneously, makes great demands on him. Respect obliges him to penetrate deeply into life and to produce works filled with wisdom and beauty, works which help people to enjoy life, to fight and win.

The Church and Religion in the Hungarian People's Republic

I. KOTELES

I

THE changed social conditions and the achievements of socialist construction have loosened the socio-economic roots of religion in the Hungarian People's Republic. The cultural revolution, the spread of Marxism-Leninism and the Party's educational work have deepened the political consciousness of the people.

This is not to say that religion is no longer rooted among the various strata of our society. There are many reasons for this. For thousands of years religious ceremonies have become a habit in the lives of the people. And, as Lenin used to say, the force of habit is a potent force. Clearly, it will take years, perhaps dozens of years, to liberate the people from the shackles of religious ideology.

The social roots of religion still persist in Hungary. We still have private property in agriculture, small private industry and trade. There are in our country many of the old exploiting classes, some of whom are bitter enemies of the People's Republic; and their reactionary political views and dislike of socialism send them back to religion for solace and consolation.

A big section of the peasants, especially the women, have not yet reached the cultural level that will enable them to break with religious superstitions on a mass scale. For this reason religion is embedded more in the countryside than it is in the towns.

In this respect external capitalist influence plays an important role. Socialist and bourgeois ideologies are in a state of sharp struggle, in which an important part is played by religion. Religion is a component part of bourgeois ideology. The Vatican and other Western ideological centres use the radio for cold-war broadcasts. As a result the part taken by religious people in the various ceremonies often increases after imperialist provocations. Thus, the 1956 counter-revolution and the war psychosis whipped up by the imperialist aggressors have had the effect of turning quite significant sections of the population back to religion.

No small role is played in this by the socio-historical conditions that have taken shape in the course of many centuries. Over a half of the population professes Catholicism. Hungary (along with Italy, Spain and Poland) was one of the most "Catholic" countries of Europe, a reliable mainstay of the Vatican. Catholicism has centuries-old traditions in Hungary. For a long time the Catholic Church greatly influenced the administration of the country. For centuries it acted as the personification of feudalism and its champion. Later, under capitalism, it made skilful use of the feudal survivals in the minds and habits of people. The demagogy of the "Christian policy" during the twenty-five years of fascist dictatorship (1919-44) had its effect on some sections. To this day the clergy engage in propaganda, particularly as far as religious instruction in the schools is concerned. At least six or seven thousand sermons are delivered every Sunday.

In the past the attitude adopted by the leaders of the Working People's Party, who encouraged mistrust of religious working people, was responsible for the fact that religion succeeded in clinging to its positions. This was aggravated by the Party's failure to pay due attention to educational work among the masses aimed at overcoming this ideology. The work was hindered by Right opportunist views, the holders of which, pleading the morbid reaction of believers whenever the matter of religion was raised, did little or nothing to combat it, thereby objectively helping to bolster up bourgeois ideology.

II

For our opponents—both those at home and those abroad—our struggle against religious superstition and the educational work conducted by us in this sphere are a violation of the freedom of worship. The purpose of this utterly false propaganda is to turn religious people against people's power, which in reality stands by the principle of liberty of conscience.

In those countries where a particular religion has been officially declared the State religion there has *never* been complete freedom of worship. In such countries the creeds professed by dissenting minorities have encountered discrimination on the part of the State. Non-Christian (and even Christian) minorities, for example in Spain, Portugal, Italy and in a number of Latin American countries, where Catholicism is the dominant religion, suffer from constant persecution.

Freedom of religion is violated not only by the State but *by the Church*. Where a Church or a religion holds sway, it displays the utmost intolerance of other religions and usually demands freedom only for itself. Dissenters are persecuted also in those countries where the official religion is Islam, Judaism or Buddhism. Before the liberation Hungary was one of the "Christian" countries where the policy of discrimination was carried out to the extreme in favour of Catholicism.

Catholicism, guided by the principle "one shepherd—one flock" seeks to make other Christians—Orthodox, Protestants—return to the Catholic Church. This determines the attitude of Catholicism to the other religions professed by minorities in a particular country—an attitude of extreme intolerance. Nor does the Protestant Church guarantee freedom of worship to heterodox believers, and wherever possible impinges on the religious freedom of the communities that have fallen away from it.

Trade in souls is still going on. The priests try to convert people professing a different religion. The competition is reminiscent of that on the capitalist market.

To the question: where is there greater freedom of worship—in the capitalist countries recognising the so-called Christian ideology or in the countries building socialism?—we shall answer by quoting the words of a Protestant theologian: ". . . The Churches and all their religions should now shame-facedly recognise the obvious fact, namely, that equality of religion can be realised or is actually being realised only in places where the Church is no

longer the determining factor in society and where there is no dominant religion, that is, in the typically non-Christian societies" (*Theologiai Szemle*, 1959, Nos. 7-8).

The Hungarian People's Republic guarantees liberty of conscience in the broadest sense of the word. Before the liberation this liberty did not exist. But today it is firmly established in our Republic.

The demand for liberty of conscience is not a specific proletarian or socialist demand. It is a general democratic demand. At the time of the bourgeois-democratic revolutions it was one of the main demands of the forward-looking bourgeoisie. Subsequently, however, the bourgeoisie abandoned this liberty.

In the Hungary of today there is genuine liberty of conscience because there is no such thing as a State religion, nor is there a dominant and, consequently, a suppressed religion. Our laws guarantee equal rights to each Church and each denomination. Every citizen enjoys liberty of conscience, everyone is free to profess the religion of his or her choice. In governmental establishments and schools there is no registration of denominational affinity, which is the purely personal and private matter of every citizen. Each denomination is free to perform its rites without any obstruction. The State bodies do not persecute religion, nor are they at the service of any Church or religion. That there is full religious liberty can be seen from the fact that religious instruction is not compulsory in our schools.

There is also freedom for non-religious views, for atheism. Everyone has the right either to practise his religion or freely to express atheist views. This provides the guarantee for the two aspects of liberty of conscience: the freedom of both religious and non-religious views.

III

In its practical work our Party makes a distinction between religious ideology, the Church and clerical reaction.

Many do not understand that a religious person can also be an active builder of socialism. This misunderstanding is rooted in a biased, sectarian attitude sometimes adopted in relation to believers. This creates an atmosphere of political mistrust around such people. Left distortions of this kind are the source of no little harm. Our Party therefore resolutely combats both the Right opportunist and Left sectarian attitudes towards religion. Neither one nor the other understand the complexity of the transitional period; their approach is over-simplified, one-sided and, consequently, incorrect.

The Socialist Workers' Party is carrying out an ideological struggle against religion as an anti-scientific and reactionary world outlook. It regards as one of its vital tasks the winning of each working man and woman for the Marxist materialist world outlook. Consequently, the Party attaches great significance to atheist education among the working people with a view to re-educating them. Still, the main part in overcoming religious survivals is played by socialist construction, active participation in which convinces people of the soundness of our cause, of the truth of the ideas of socialism. It follows, then, that *our Party always subordinates the task of overcoming religious views to the interests of our general policy, of class struggle and socialist construction*, and rejects all attempts—no matter whence they come—at making the religious issue the pivot of political life.

Objectively such attempts bring grist to the mills of our class enemies, help them to divide the working people on religious grounds, to set believers against non-believers, which can but retard the building of socialism. The most important thing for all our people is that the workers, peasants and intellectuals should, in fraternal unity and amity, build the socialist future which assures material and spiritual abundance and simultaneously saps the social foundations of religion. We are, therefore, fighting not against believers, but against religion as an ideology, to shape the new outlook of the working people.

The proletarian State cannot be neutral in this ideological struggle, and regards as its prime duty the dissemination of a scientific, Marxist-Leninist world outlook in the schools, universities and in governmental establishments, using for this purpose public cultural organisations as well.

In its struggle against the religious outlook our State practises tolerance, tact and circumspection. It does not abuse the feelings of believers nor restrict religious liberty. Respect for the religious sentiment of believers does not mean, however, that the propagation of the scientific world outlook is not pushed ahead. Our educational work in this respect will be successful only if we combat not only the traditional, but also the modern forms and arguments of religious apologetics.

It should be borne in mind that the apologists for religion have adopted new tactics and, taking cognisance of the changes in the world, aim at making religion acceptable by using

more streamlined and flexible methods. This is observed, for example, in the inter-relations between science and religion. In this respect there are two basic trends.

One of these derives chiefly from the principle of the double truth (*veritas duplex*) according to which both science and religion are true: let science prevail in the sphere of material interests, but religion should hold sway in the sphere of spiritual needs. Today when the space rockets leave less and less room in the cosmos for God, the priests vigorously uphold this principle in the endeavour to preserve religious ideology in the minds of people.

The other trend seeks, on the contrary, to reconcile science with religion. Many articles have appeared in religious publications to the effect that there is no contradiction between science and religion, that the contradiction which "definite" circles claim to see is but a seeming one. Scientific achievements, so the argument runs, far from refuting religious dogma corroborate it. This, for example, is what we read in a Catholic weekly: ". . . There is not a single one of the established truths of science that could not be made to harmonise with our world outlook . . ."; ". . . inasmuch as we strictly adhere to both science and religion, there can be no conflict between the two. . . ." (*Uj Ember*, November 22nd, 1959). Basing themselves on these concepts the prelates interpret in a completely arbitrary way the scientific discoveries and hypotheses, and do not hesitate even to "modify" them with a view to distorting their meaning in favour of religion.

In any case the march of science has placed the prelates in an awkward predicament. It is clear that the religious dogma about the creation is by no means compatible with the data furnished by science. The rapid development of science is making nonsense of this thousands-year-old dogma.

As stated previously, the people's State regards religion as the personal affair of every citizen. Our Party, however, does not regard it as the personal affair of its members. The Party conducts ideological struggle against religious superstition. In this struggle there is not, nor can there be, an ideological compromise. This struggle and educational work are under way at all levels. The Party attaches the utmost significance to popularising the achievements of science. It has no desire to engage in long-winded discussions as to whether or not religion is correct; it concentrates on explaining scientific discoveries, because this is the best way to overcome religious views.

Our aim is gradually to replace religious rituals by secular ceremonies, ceremonies of a new kind—the naming of an infant instead of the baptism, secular marriage instead of the Church ceremony, etc.

The complex conditions of the transitional period force us to reckon with religious survivals even among some Party members. It would be wrong and harmful to treat this with sectarian intolerance and to choose the easiest, but certainly not the most rational, way of strict administrative action. What is needed is to convince those members who have not yet finally got rid of religious ideas that by adhering to their backward concepts they make it easier for non-Marxist views to penetrate into the Party. It is most important to conduct ideological educational work among such members, to show them the sources of religion and the factors which caused it to emerge.

The Party members who have not as yet overcome the hangovers of religion in their minds are themselves battling against them. In this they are assisted by their comrades, for only in this way will we be able to help these members gradually to cast overboard the last vestiges of superstition.

There have been cases in the past, chiefly in the rural Party organisations, of some functionaries and members of the local Party committees taking part in religious ceremonies. The Party cannot tolerate this. But at the same time it sees the difference between active and passive participation in these rites. The Party member who baptises his child of his own volition, whose child studies religion at school, who allows his children to be confirmed, insists on a church wedding, attends church or takes part in processions, should explain his behaviour to the Party organisation. Such a Party member should not be allowed to conduct Party work.

There are also cases when Party functionaries are obliged to attend Church ceremonies, particularly funerals. But when they begin to justify their regular participation in religious ceremonies on the grounds that they do so under pressure of public opinion and for the sake of establishing closer contact with the masses, we regard this as an opportunist excuse which can but harm the cause of establishing closer relations between the Party and the masses. The Party, naturally, takes public opinion into account and influences it; it should not permit a situation when its members have backward views.

The Party cannot tolerate the propagation of religious views in its ranks. Those who propagate religion either inside or outside its ranks cannot be members of the Marxist-Leninist Party.

The Party steadfastly upholds the fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism. It takes cognisance, however, of what is specific in the situation. An unscrupulous, conciliatory attitude as well as intolerance, sectarianism or an extreme radical approach weaken rather than strengthen contact with the masses and instead of overcoming religious survivals in the minds of people serve to strengthen them. Only rational work to foster the *communist* world outlook achieves its aim.

IV

Political clericalism, always reactionary, has long been a feature of life in Hungary. Throughout our history this clericalism has acted against the people. Here are some examples from the recent past.

In 1919, at the time of the Hungarian Soviet Republic, Janos Cardinal Csernoch sent a letter to the Vatican via the Italian military mission, in which he wrote: ". . . Even in the event of the Powers not contemplating the occupation of Hungary and crushing communism by armed force, but closing the frontiers and waiting until the internal disintegration leads to the end, it would be most important for the Powers to have, in the very heart of the Bolshevik State, such an organisation which, by virtue of its very nature, would resist the strivings of the Bolsheviks. Such an organisation, as everybody knows, is the Church. . . ." As we see even in those days clerical forces were among the reactionaries entrenched in the rear of the Hungarian Soviet Republic.

And it was these forces who rushed to the support of Horthy's fascist regime. The notorious "White terror" perpetrated fearful brutalities to the accompaniment of the "Christian policy" slogan; they "reformed" public education and introduced fascist legislation. And the clerical reactionaries were the chief supporters of this "Christian policy". In 1919, at the time of the "White terror", Bishop Ottokar Prohaszka wrote in his Christmas message: ". . . The Gospel, it is true, signifies love and peace. But this is a love that brings fire as well as the sword and the whip. . . ." And the "sword and whip" were the true symbols of the "Christian policy". Speaking in Parliament in 1920, this self-same Prohaszka said: ". . . My programme is a national Christian programme. . . . Its urgency derives from the fact that today the so-called cautious policy is simply not enough and in any case is unfeasible" (*Namzeti ujsag*, January 4th, 1920). This Prohaszka is well remembered by the Catholic Church, and his writings are scrupulously studied.

Political clericalism played quite an important part in preparing the intervention against the Soviet Union and the war of revenge against the neighbouring nations. In a "confidential" letter to the clergy Cardinal Seredi urged them to recruit volunteers for the Horthy army and to inform the authorities concerning the political reliability of the recruits.

Reactionaries among the Protestant clergy also supported the Horthy regime. In sermons and articles Laszlo Ravasz, the Protestant bishop, extolled Horthy and the fascist regime, and urged support for the war.

Of the crimes perpetrated by the clericals the one that evoked the greatest hatred of the people was the alacrity with which they supplied the Horthy regime with ideological ammunition, and their advocacy of fascism in the guise of "religious morality" and "Christianity". In doing so they poisoned the minds of an entire generation.

In the period after the liberation from the fascist yoke and before the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat (1945-48) political clericalism fought against the democratic reforms in our country. Jointly with secular reaction it conducted an open fight against the Communist Party and all the progressive forces. In those days Church affairs were in the hands of out-and-out reactionaries headed by Cardinal Mindszenthy. Mindszenthy took under his protection the defeated fascist clique, those who had committed grave crimes against the people and who were subsequently brought before the court. Many of these had donned clerical garb in an attempt to evade the hand of justice.

When the reactionaries suffered defeat and the working class took power into its hands, Mindszenthy redoubled his efforts to rally the forces of black reaction inside the Church, turning the latter into a counter-revolutionary political centre against people's democracy. This plotting was exposed and made known to the public. The reactionary prelates who had become political conspirators against people's rule were made to answer before the law. This led to a loss of prestige and their influence gradually declined.

Then in 1956, at the time of the counter-revolutionary putsch, the prelates, still dreaming

of a return to the past, lost no time in returning to the political scene. They strove hard to use the Churches as tools of the counter-revolution. The speeches of Mindszenthy, Laszlo Ravasz and Lajos Ordas and the emergence of so-called Christian political parties made it pretty clear that the reactionary clergy were preparing for an all-out drive against the people's democratic system. Their political programme was formulated on November 3rd, 1956, by Mindszenthy, who declared: "We want to be a nation founded on private property, wisely and justly restricted in keeping with the public interests." The real meaning of his speech was so unmistakable that even the religious people among the workers and peasants had no difficulty in grasping the political aims for which the clerical reactionaries were using their faith.

Even after the counter-revolution had been crushed, the prelates did not retreat at once, they simply changed their tactics. As was the case in 1945, they again tried to organise a political provocation in connection with religious instruction in the schools, tried to instigate the believers against the worker-peasant government, and to prevent the economic and political consolidation of the country. They launched, moreover, a frenzied campaign against the democratic clergy.

Our State, naturally, could not be a neutral observer in this struggle. Early in 1957 the government declared that, in keeping with the 1948-50 agreement, it was anxious to resolve the relations between the State and the Church, and this was done. The outcome was that the democratic clergy were reinstated. The reactionary clergy were relegated to the background, while the position of the clergy who marched in step with the people became stronger.

We still have reactionaries among the clergy in Hungary. But they have lost so much support that they prefer to keep silence. This does not, of course, mean that they have completely relinquished struggle against people's rule. They are still active, chiefly inside the Church and, understandably, against the loyal clergy. Their sphere of activity, however, is shrinking all the time, and not only because they are opposed by the State but also because the loyal forces in the Church are, with increasing vigour, combating the reactionary extremists.

An analysis of the activity conducted by clerical reaction, both past and present, shows that it has always made maximum use of international contacts. The clerical reactionaries in our country are an organised force propagating the views of international reaction in the struggle against socialism. They can be described as the outposts of international imperialism in our country.

They maintain, for example, contact with the Vatican, which is the avowed enemy of the Hungarian People's Republic. The Vatican hates our socialist system because it is not landlords, capitalists and prelates who are at the helm of State, but working people; it regards as its enemies even those believers among the working people who support socialism. After the counter-revolution the Vatican went all out to prevent the internal and external consolidation of our country. It is still conducting cold-war propaganda against us. But our State, naturally, is rebuffing the Vatican's attempts to meddle in our internal affairs. At the same time the State does not interfere in any way with religious matters.

From the foregoing it will be seen that our Party adheres to the view that clerical reaction is *political reaction* which, masked as a religious ideology, is working to bring believers under its sway. Consequently, the struggle against it is a *political struggle*. It follows, then, that there is a profound political contradiction between the socialist system and clerical reaction. And on the extent to which we succeed in explaining to the working people that this reaction stands for international imperialism and against the interests of our people, depends whether we shall succeed in winning them from the influence of clericalism and in putting an end to its subversion.

This struggle is a component of the struggle waged by our socialist State against all its political enemies. In waging it we combine administrative measures with political exposure, explanation and persuasion. Not only non-believers but also believers and clergy loyal to our socialist country are taking part in it. This struggle will facilitate also our socialist construction and, for this reason, it is essential to develop it on a large scale and in all directions.

V

Prior to the liberation, the relations between State and Church were determined by the identity of their basic interests. The Churches, principally the Catholic Church, had owned vast tracts of land and had huge financial resources. The Roman Catholic Church, for

instance, owned 866,000 *holds*[1] of land. This explains why the clergy spared no effort to defend the semi-feudal system.

In the post-liberation years (1945-48) the prelates, in the guise of religion and taking advantage of the religious feelings of the masses, did all in their power to set the working people against the Communist Party, which fought for worker-peasant rule, for socialism. They preached that the struggle to take over the big estates, including those belonging to the Church, and for the abolition of capitalist private property, was a struggle waged by the Communists against religion and the Church. Thanks, however, to the Party's sound policy and explanatory work this preaching was of little avail. Religious people realised that this was a struggle not against religion but against capitalism, against the exploiting classes.

With the establishment of the proletarian dictatorship, the exposure of the reactionary clergy, and the beginning of the socialist construction significant changes took place in the Church. There emerged a group of loyal clergy who recognised people's democracy. This resulted in 1948-50 in an agreement between our State and the Church. The State guaranteed freedom of worship and granted the Church considerable material aid. The Church, in its turn, undertook to discontinue support to any attempt to restore capitalism. Thus normal relations were established between the State and the Church. And though these relations were temporarily disrupted by the 1956 counter-revolution, today the clergy, with the exception of the reactionaries, readily co-operate with the State in some political issues.

There are differences inside the Church on the relations with the State. The reactionaries object to the Church being loyal to State policy. However, the forces, chiefly among the lower clergy which reject this line, are numerous. They hold that the political attitude adopted by the Catholic reactionaries is unsound, that it is harmful to the Church, since it estranges from it most of the faithful who believe in socialism.

The lower clergy are aware that throughout its history the Church has survived solely because it adapted itself to the replacement of one social system by another. It is obvious, however, that most of this lower clergy abide by people's democracy not for the sake of socialism but because the interests of the Church necessitate this.

Some of them agree on many points with our government. They can see what it has done to improve the conditions of the people, and this has greatly affected their attitude. This part of the clergy which supports our system is growing.

Those of the lower clergy who stand for good relations with the State realise that people's democracy is not something "temporary", but a system which has triumphed in our country, and that the Church should adjust itself to the new system. Consequently they are exerting no little pressure on the bishops, and want them, too, to be loyal to the socialist State, otherwise they will but discredit the Church in the eyes of the public.

There is a serious political conflict on this issue between the lower clergy and the reactionary prelates hostile to people's rule and supported by the Vatican. The Vatican, some of the bishops and other reactionary clericals still cherish the illusion that people's democracy is a transient thing. For this reason they are against normal relations between State and Church.

They would prefer to disrupt the normal state of affairs particularly by stressing ideological differences and accentuating them. Those of the clergy who stand for good relations with the State do not accept this. The village priests, for instance, are greatly influenced by the peasants who have chosen the socialist way, the way of producer co-operatives. The peasants reject the anti-socialist, reactionary attitude adopted by some priests. This applies in even greater measure to the more realistic clergy in the working-class districts. Knowing the political attitude of the workers and peasants, more and more priests are becoming convinced that people's democracy is a stable social system. And some of the bishops, too, are beginning to understand that the views held by the Vatican and the clerical reactionaries that people's democracy is something transient are absolutely hopeless and simply spell danger for the Church, because political illusions of this kind can but result in the believers turning their backs on the Church. And that, of course, is what the bishops do not want. Consequently most of them do not resist the building of socialism and, despite the pressure brought to bear by the Vatican and the reactionaries in their midst, refrain from any action against the worker-peasant rule.

We believe that the episcopate will be acting correctly if, ignoring the pressure exerted by the reactionaries, they align themselves with the forward-looking clergy, who promote normal relations between State and Church. "The episcopate which have more than once

[1]One hold = 1.42 acres.—Ed.

demonstrated their loyalty to the government, cannot simultaneously be loyal to the individual reactionary priests . . . who during the counter-revolution were implanted by Cardinal Mindszenthy in the offices from which the priests who supported peace were driven out. It is our hope that the episcopate will realise the futility of this two-faced loyalty—both to the government and to the reactionary priests who oppose the government," said Gyula Kallai at a meeting of the State Assembly on April 18th, 1958. Yes, we are all for normal political relations with the Church in the future too. This, however, implies that the reactionary clergy, chiefly inside the Catholic Church, should not have any say in shaping its policy.

Modern Science and the Conquest of Space

G. POKROVSKY

Man's Conquest of Space is Not Only a Scientific Problem

HISTORY shows that, together with general progress in the spheres of industry and knowledge, different epochs are distinguished by achievements which clearly delineate the economic level, the political structure and the trend of development.

Judged from this angle, the most significant event of the last decade in science and engineering is, undoubtedly, the penetration of the cosmos by man-made satellites.

The motion of a space-vehicle is similar to that of the celestial bodies. The motion derives from the power behind the initial thrust, after which the space-vehicle continues its flight without any further expenditure of energy. In this respect motion in space differs from mechanical motion on the earth, where constant expenditure of energy is needed to overcome gravity and atmospheric drag.

The initial conditions are of decisive significance for space flight. The velocity and the direction of the motion call for the utmost precision, since even the slightest miscalculation can substantially change the course and the range of the flight.

A number of conditions is needed for solving problems of this kind—heavy industry and instrument-making, electronics, radio engineering, geophysics, astrophysics, etc.

Characteristic here are the interaction and co-operation of the various branches of science and industry. It is hard to find another sphere of human activity in which co-operation is developed to such an extent as in the techniques of cosmic flight and exploration. Man's conquest of space is not only a matter of science. *It is a matter which deeply affects politics and world outlook and is of concern to all mankind.*

The history of technological progress shows that the basic features of particular instruments and machines have developed more or less smoothly. The capacity of electric power stations, ship and aircraft engines has steadily risen, as well as the size of ships, aeroplanes, etc. Spasmodic growth of technological characteristics is a rare thing.

In recent years, however, rocketry has made unprecedented progress in velocity, thrust and power.

Remarkable progress has been made in structural mechanics and in the power of rockets. Basing ourselves on the theory of the famous Russian scientist Tsiolkovsky, and bearing in mind that the Soviet luniks carried instrumentation weighing over a ton and developed a velocity of up to 12 kilometres per second, we can easily calculate that the overall weight of the carrier rocket at the moment of launching was in the neighbourhood of a thousand tons.

Given this weight of the carrier rocket, the thrust of the engine installed in the first stage should be in the vicinity of several thousand tons, equalling the power of the jet engines of approximately one hundred "TU-104" planes. The rocket power is more than ten times that of the Kuibyshev hydroelectric station on the Volga. Thus the power of the comparatively small (in size and weight) engine of the first propulsive unit leaves far behind the world's powerful hydroelectric station, completed at the time when the launching of the first space vehicles was in preparation.

No less striking is the success in the sphere of telecontrol. In the pre-rocket period radio communication was confined to the earth-bound distance of no more than 20,000 kilometres, but the first Soviet luniks recorded a two-way automatic wireless communication at distances of half a million and more kilometres.

It is interesting to note that a possible way of guiding a rocket is a giant gun barrel formed by radio-waves within which the rocket moves like a shell. Such a gun barrel would stretch

in space over hundreds and thousands of kilometres. Here we have an example of how radio waves form quite a material electromagnetic "structure" tens of thousands of times bigger than the biggest structures made of steel and other materials. We can see from this how man is advancing, from the times when he used different forms of matter consisting of atoms and known as substance, to the time when he will use other, non-atom forms of matter, especially electro-magnetic fields and radio-waves.

This signifies an unprecendented advance in man's conquest of nature. Even we cannot fully appreciate the entire significance of this development. No doubt the generations to come will regard it as the greatest revolution in the means of production and research.

The use of automatic and tele-controlled devices facilitates the exceptional accuracy of rocket flights. In January this year the penultimate stage of the Soviet space rocket reached the designated area in the Pacific at a point less than two kilometres from the target, the distance from the launching site being 12,500 kilometres along the earth's surface. Similar experiments were continued in July, with the target area less than half the size. This is proof of the increased accuracy of rocketry.

Until recently space exploration was based on automation and radio communication. Photographing the other side of the moon on different scales, developing the films and transmitting the pictures to earth by radio were done automatically. The most complex and manifold research, up to the transmission of television pictures from the moon and the physico-chemical analysis of the substance on the lunar surface, can be and will be carried out by automatic devices. This is due in the main to the progress made in automation and electronics. But successful experiments with the launching of animals have been conducted in the Soviet Union and the United States over a number of years. In July last year the TASS agency reported the safe return of a container carrying several animals. These results were confirmed by further experiments in July and August this year. The launching of the space-ship with living creatures on board and a safe return to earth was a triumph for Soviet science and engineering, a major contribution to world science. *The practical possibility of space flights by man is thus being created.*

The flights of the Soviet space-ships give us grounds for saying that rocketry is now in a position to ensure the safe launching and return of a manned space-ship. For this purpose a sealed cabin of adequate size has been built with facilities for purifying the air, restoring the stock of oxygen, and also for maintaining the required temperature, humidity and atmospheric pressure. This cabin can carry enough water and food, as well as observation and radio communication instruments.

To put it briefly, terrestrial gravity has been overcome and it is now possible to thrust into space part of the environment in which man lives, part of the earth's biosphere. Only under such conditions can we speak about space flights by man. It is our view that the space-ship with a man or men on board should be launched from the polar regions in order to avoid the harmful influence of belts of high-energy particles, discovered by Vernov and Chernov (Soviet Union) and Van Allen (United States) with the aid of satellites and space rockets. These belts girdle the globe near the equator. Man should not be put into orbit during the periods of increased activity of the sun when nuclear explosions of exceptional power occur on its surface. Thestreams of high-energy particles released into space reach the region of the earth in a few hours and could gravely injure space passengers. These difficulties, however, can be surmounted. They will, apparently, be overcome completely sometime in the 'sixties, and soon man will be conscious of his power over space.

But one should not think that manned space flights will make automatic instruments unnecessary. On the contrary, these instruments will develop at a rapid rate.

Theoretically speaking, it is now possible to reproduce the actions of man, particularly with the aid of radio-controlled mechanical hands, and to transmit pictures and sounds so that an operator staying in a comfortable laboratory on earth will be able to observe and feel the features of the moon, to which the corresponding automatic apparatuses had been delivered by a rocket.

Preparations for man's flight into space are not exhausted by the pre-arranged plan for scientific exploration. Not a few people are eager to risk the dangers of a flight. In fact space flight is becoming a clearly expressed *spiritual need of man.* Satisfaction of this need will have far-reaching consequences. It is evident that the launching of a man will tremendously enhance *the moral and political prestige* of the country which will be the first to do this.

Exploration in the Earth-Moon Region

It would be premature now to sum up all the results of recent research conducted with the aid of space-vehicles and satellites. Much material has been accumulated, but much of it remains to be fully analysed. However, the characteristic features of this research can be noted.

Included here in the first place should be the data on the upper layers of the earth's atmosphere. This atmosphere stretches in a very rarefied condition to a very considerable distance from the earth. Particularly important is the interaction of the streams of charged particles with the magnetic field of the earth. This interaction leads to the formation of two concentric belts of particles girdling the earth along the equator. The moon, which has no magnetic field of its own (as has been established with the aid of the first Soviet space rocket), has no belts of high-energy particles.

The discovery of the basic properties of the magnetic gaseous dynamics of the upper layers of the earth's atmosphere has paved the way to the study of the exchange of energy between the sun, the atmosphere and outer space, to the study of the effects on the atmosphere of the radiation caused by sunspots and the super-powerful nuclear explosions which occur in the periods of intensified solar activity. It can be supposed that this radiation greatly influences the weather and many geophysical processes.

At present, weather forecasts, especially long-term ones, are extremely inaccurate, and often do not meet the needs of agriculture, of air, sea, rail and road transport, etc. Study of the properties of the upper layers of the atmosphere with the aid of space rockets and artificial satellites will make short-term and especially long-term forecasts more precise.

An important practical result is the discovery of the comparatively slight danger of the space-ship colliding with small meteors. It is to be hoped that in future automatic cosmic stations will be able to function for a long time without being destroyed or damaged by meteors or meteoric dust.

From the technological standpoint the installing of solar batteries aboard the space-ships was not a particularly difficult matter. But the solving of this problem is of great importance; it is man's first step towards exploiting the cosmic resources, towards building space-ships capable of functioning in outer space without getting power from the earth.

The Soviet space pioneers are *exploring and studying the Universe for the benefit of humanity*. In particular, the Soviet scientists aim at protecting possible life from infection on those planets to which the first space-ships are sent. The first Lunik, for instance, was completely sterilised, though this measure complicated the already difficult task—delivery of the pennant and research.

Competition Between the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.A. in Space Exploration

In recent years attention has been focused on space rocketry. Many people are interested, perhaps, not so much in particular technological and scientific results as in the potentialities of two great powers—the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.A.—for solving the scientific and technical problems of unprecedented scope and complexity. And this is understandable. For it is a matter of the potential of the two social systems—socialism, which is advancing towards communism in the U.S.S.R., and capitalism, which is doomed by history.

No reactionary propaganda can conceal the Soviet achievements. The sputniks passed over many countries; all could see them, while radio amateurs picked up their signals.

The first round of this competition is now over. The launching of earth and solar satellites has been mastered, the earth-moon route has been explored. We now know the structure of the upper layers of the atmosphere. The successful return of space-vehicles to the earth has been demonstrated. Much has also been done in other spheres.

What, then, are the results of the first round?

1. All types of space-vehicles—artificial satellites, artificial planets and moon rockets—were first launched by the U.S.S.R. Despite the concentration of effort and means, the high technological level and organisation of production in the U.S.A. and the attention given by the U.S. Government to this matter, the American scientists could but repeat some of the Soviet achievements.

2. The most difficult tasks as, for instance, the delivery of the pennant to the moon, photographing the other side of the moon and the landing of a rocket within 2 kilometres of the target area—these could not be repeated by the U.S.A. even after the experiments had been carried out by the Soviet Union.

3. As we know from the press, the rockets launched in the United States often exploded,

deviated from the prescribed course or failed to rise. These inaccuracies and mishaps are in contradiction to the high level reached by the leading capitalist countries in other spheres of technology.

4. Quite a number of U.S. space-vehicles were assembled of components originally designed for other purposes. Medium-range missiles were used as propulsive units in the multi-stage space rocket systems. This made it impossible to build a complete vehicle of the best qualities. Evidently this inefficient method of construction is to be explained by the extreme haste and nervousness occasioned by the fact that the rate of development of Soviet rocketry was too fast even for the United States.

5. Unlike the U.S. rockets, the Soviet rockets were unprecedented in dimensions, payload, accuracy, and in such achievements as, for instance, exploring the earth-moon route. This is proof of the high level of clearness of purpose, consistent work and research in Soviet rocket construction, and of the morale and unity of the collective workers, engineers and scientists who built them.

The Soviet rockets are not only a brilliant piece of engineering, not only an unprecedented achievement in the conquest of nature. They are the expression of the creative enthusiasm of the immense collective which is the Soviet people. In socialist society, in which there are no social antagonisms, every man gives of his best to the common cause, confident that his labour will not be wasted. Socialist planning and the excellently organised labour of the people yield greater results the more complex and difficult the task tackled by them. It is no wonder therefore that the superiority of socialism over capitalism becomes clearer the farther the U.S.S.R. and the other socialist countries advance along the highway of progress.

For the peoples of the world the Soviet space rockets are not only means of exploring the cosmos, they are first of all indisputable proof of *the vitality of socialism*. Soviet rocketry shows what man under communism, working creatively, will be able to do.

The German designer Wernher von Braun, now the U.S. chief rocket expert, assessing the development of rocketry in the United States, has admitted the profound misunderstanding of the role of science in that country. We are convinced, he said, that despite all the fine words, we are not yet making sufficient efforts to make use of the knowledge obtained with such difficulty over the years. This, perhaps, is explained by the fact that science is not accessible to the masses, by inability to appreciate the needs of science, which is the result of poor popularisation. Von Braun pointed out that it was the launching of the Soviet sputnik that gave an impetus to rocketry development in the United States.

How remote are these pessimistic and vague thoughts from the clear and purposeful enthusiasm which inspires the builders of Soviet space-vehicles! The co-operation of the different branches of science and engineering, and the organisation of labour in rocketry, have reached a level which is possible only under planning of vast resources and on the basis of the morale, unity and enthusiasm typical of the people in a socialist country.

Soviet rocketry, designed chiefly for peaceful exploration of outer space, is a striking indication of how the people in the other socialist countries will work while advancing to communism.

In the conditions of today Soviet rocketry, naturally, is also a means of defence of the U.S.S.R. and of the entire socialist camp. It has added enormously to our defence capacity and gives confidence in the possibility of peaceful labour in the future. But basically Soviet rocketry is of a *peaceful character*; it benefits all peoples. There are those in the United States who talk glibly about building a spy rocket, a spy satellite; this boasting merely lays bare the corrupt influence exerted by the top military on science and technology.

Man's Power Over Nature for the Benefit of the People

The achievements in the exploration of outer space are obviously only a beginning. The first stage of our penetration into space demonstrated the immense growth of man's power over nature. The task now is to use this power *for the benefit of all*.

In the past few years we have seen a number of examples of fruitful co-operation between countries in various undertakings. Fruitful in this respect was the co-operation of scientists during the first International Geophysical Year. Here one should note the international agreement (December 1959) on peaceful development of the Antarctic. This shows that in solving problems of concern to all peaceful co-operation between countries regardless of their internal system is feasible.

This experience is useful for outlining the perspectives and for joint efforts in exploring outer space. Clearly we should first undertake tasks the solution of which would benefit as quickly as possible the greatest number of people in the various countries.

It is difficult to review in the space of one article the entire programme of research feasible at the present moment and capable of bringing practical results to all. We shall mention therefore only some immediate tasks. (We will not deal with particular plans for further work, but rather seek to illustrate the vast opportunities which are opening up, in our opinion, in the field of cosmic science and technology.) For instance, we are thinking in terms of a continuously operating system of earth satellites for purposes of meteorological observations in the upper layers of the atmosphere, of ascertaining how energy circulates between these layers and outer space, and how the streams of high-energy radiation pierce the atmosphere during increased solar activity.

In all probability such observations will add substantially to our knowledge of the processes taking place in the earth's atmosphere and enable us to forecast the weather more accurately for longer periods. It has been calculated that this alone will make it possible to save in various countries up to 500,000 million roubles a year, thanks to the reduction of losses to agriculture from unexpected drought, flooding and frost. Long-term weather forecasts can be given for the earth as a whole. This sum would suffice to cover all the expenditure on the further development of cosmic science and technology.

Another international task could be, in our view, the study of the moon, and of Mars and Venus. It could be done by taking colour photographs of the celestial bodies, by studying their atmosphere, magnetic and electric fields, the exchange of energy with outer space, etc. Further, it will be possible to deliver to the moon, and later to Mars and Venus, automatic laboratories with television cameras and other instruments controlled from the earth by radio. It would be useful to put into orbit giant telescopes equipped with television cameras. This could yield tremendous results both for the study of stars, cosmic gaseous clouds, the sun and planets, and for the study of the earth by means of observing it at varying distances from outer space.

Much could be achieved by using special communication sputniks for radio-relaying; and television transmission over great distances, and also for geodesy, and for sea and air navigation.

Together with solving the technological tasks directly associated with pressing needs, man will, undoubtedly, undertake space flights aimed at solving more remote tasks.

It is quite probable that the next few years will see flights by inter-continental space-ships for the super-fast transportation of man and cargoes from one point of the globe to another. By rising above the dense layers of the atmosphere these craft could cover long distances in less than an hour. Flights from Europe to the Antarctic, for instance, would take about fifty minutes, perhaps less. Round-the-earth flights at altitudes ranging from 300 to tens of thousands of kilometres would be also possible.

Later, man will be able to circumnavigate the moon, Mars and Venus. The landing of a man on the moon and other planets will probably be preceded by sending automatic instruments, television transmitters in particular, to these celestial bodies. The landing itself is quite feasible. But for this purpose very large space-ships will be needed and many difficult tasks will have to be solved. Man can be sent to outer space only if his safe return is guaranteed. It seems that man will be able to take off for other celestial bodies not earlier than 1970-75.

• • •

Outer space can and must be used for peaceful co-operation and competition by all nations. And this can bring tremendous benefit to man within the next few years.

The people in all countries are behind the Soviet Union in its struggle for peace and total disarmament. As Khrushchov put it, "the present age has produced new means of mass annihilation, but it has also brought home to the peoples the necessity of preventing war and ensuring peace". Not only the scientist and the expert but the layman, too, is becoming aware of his responsibility for the application *for peace* of the new achievements of science and technology, the destructive force of which the imperialist circles aim at using for their purposes. To paralyse the destructive power of the rockets, place them under public control —that is the demand of the day. Acceptance of the Soviet proposals for general and complete disarmament would make it possible to raise the question of using the missiles and the war industry of the big powers for peaceful exploration of outer space, for the benefit of all. This would be a brilliant example of "beating swords into ploughshares", for which Khrushchov called at the U.N. General Assembly last autumn.

The British Labour Party Today

K. ZILLIACUS

The article printed below was written by the author at the request of the Editorial Board. The Board welcome this contribution from Mr. Zilliacus, a spokesman of the Social Democratic Left.

Since on a number of vital issues of the day there is a degree of identity in the views of the Communists and the Left Socialists many of their differences can be composed by way of comradely discussion. In this connection we believe that the article appearing in this number by the Austrian Communist Scharf will be a contribution to the discussion.

THE British Labour Party is convulsed by a crisis over great issues of principle and policy which has been growing for some years. It will probably rise to a climax at the Annual Conference of the Party which will be held in Scarborough at the beginning of this October. It reflects the anxieties and perplexities of the whole nation over Britain's position in the age of atomic energy and ideological conflict.

In order to understand this crisis and what it portends it is necessary first to take a look at the Labour Party. For the roots of the crisis lie deep in Labour's past.

The Labour Party is flesh of the flesh and bone of the bone of the British working class, made by them in their own image. It displays the characteristic features of the British people. In its composition it is a true cross-section of the nation, most of whom are workers. In structure it is unique but can best be compared to a cross between a Social Democratic Party and a Popular Front. In spirit it is not only a Party but, as it is fond of calling itself, a movement.

The Party is very British in its abhorrence of theory and doctrine and its addiction to empiricism, rule of thumb, and "muddle through".

It is British, too, in its profound belief in democracy and political freedom both as a system of government and as a way of life. (It should not be forgotten that democracy in Britain came, not handed down from above, but as a result of long struggles by the people against the ruling classes.) On the other hand, its conception of democracy is thoroughly practical.

Because the Labour Party is a Social Democratic Party its leaders are always in danger of falling victim to the senile disease of Rightism, which is an occupational hazard of Social Democratic parties. But because it is a Popular Front, the mass party of the British working class, it can never move bodily away from the workers and in the final analysis expresses their will.

The present-day Party consists of nearly six million members politically affiliated through their trade unions, through paying the small political affiliation supplement when paying in their trade union contributions. There are some 800,000 individual members of the Party organised by constituencies (the 1918 Constitution made it possible to be an individual member of the Party).

The individual members are the most active and radical elements in the Party. They are for the most part also trade unionists, so that the Party is overwhelmingly working class in character, although the proportion tends to diminish the higher one goes in the Party.

Although formed in 1900, it was not until 1918 that the Party adopted a new Constitution in which it definitely proclaimed socialism as its aim. The First World War made it aware of the fact, first of all, that foreign affairs mattered and that no government could fight a war without the support of Labour and its representatives.

During the years between the wars the Labour Party stood for the establishment of a collective security system with the U.S.S.R. participating in it against fascist aggression. But they did so mostly in a confused, half-hearted way, and after violent struggles between Left and Right.

The normal dynamic of the Labour Party is a constant struggle between Right and Left, in which at certain periods the Left has been represented chiefly in the trade unions, at others in the political side of the movement. Normal struggle becomes a crisis when instead of being an argument about how best to pursue aims held in common, it becomes a clash over the aims themselves.

The first such crisis occurred as far back as 1906, when the leaders of the infant

Labour Party were in imminent danger of becoming an appendage to the Liberal Party and devoted to social reform within the framework of capitalism. This danger was averted by the insistence of the Left, especially those in the unions, on "work or maintenance" for the unemployed. (This at the time was regarded by laissez-faire Liberals, as well as Tories, as rank socialism and objectionable in principle.) As a result the struggle ensued, the crisis was overcome and the Party established as an independent political working-class force.

The second crisis (1931) was in the great world slump, when the right-wing leaders went out for national unity to save the country—that is, capitalism—in the economic crisis. Instead of splitting the Party, however, as Ramsay MacDonald had hoped, he merely splintered himself and a handful of personal adherents off from the Party. The political lesson taught by that crisis was that loyalty to leaders must be conditional on the leaders being loyal to party policies and principles.

The third and greatest crisis of the Labour Party began soon after the Labour Government assumed office in 1945, and has been growing ever since. It started in the field of international affairs. But it has long spread to basic issues in home affairs, for the two cannot be separated. In his 1937 book *The Labour Party in Perspective* Clement Attlee wrote justly that: "It must be perfectly clear that the Labour Party rejects altogether the theory that foreign policy is something which must be kept out of party politics. It does not agree that there is some policy to be pursued in this country irrespective of what party is in power, a policy which is national and so transcends party differences. There is a deep difference of opinion between the Labour Party and the capitalist parties on foreign as well as on home policy, because the two cannot be separated."

During the 1945 election the programme of the Labour Party insisted that the spread of socialism was the only safeguard against a return of fascism, and the only sure foundation for prosperity, freedom, and democracy in the postwar world. When Labour came to power, it first of all threw overboard the international programme on which it had been elected, which called for co-operation with both the Soviet Union and the United States through a world organisation, and pledged the Party not to join either in an alliance against the other. As Walter Lippman pointed out at the time (*New York Herald Tribune*, June 5th, 1946): "The line followed by Mr. Bevin in his first ten months was not consistent with the promises and doctrines of the British Labour Party. Mr. Bevin's policy has been to carry on the policies he found when he took office and to adhere to the line laid down by Mr. Churchill and the old hands of the Foreign Office".

This line led to the cold war, the new arms race, and growing subordination to the United States in N.A.T.O. set up with the help of the Labour Government. The economic and social consequences of this policy began increasingly to sap the domestic achievements of the Labour Government and to demoralise the Party and create dissension in its ranks.

The strait-jacketing of the social services in the last years of the Labour Government to meet defence expenditure; the Korean War and the soaring prices and financial crisis it brought on; and the vast defence programme to which the Labour Government committed itself under American pressure, gave it the *coup de grâce*.

In the years 1952 to 1953 we were treated to the spectacle in Parliament of what one Conservative paper facetiously referred to as the three Parties—the Tory Government, the Labour Opposition, and the Labour ex-Ministers, who were so busy defending their record of national unity with the Tories in foreign affairs and defence, that they spent as much time fighting their own back benchers as they did the Government.

At the Morecambe Conference in 1952, the Left captured the seven seats on the National Executive Committee elected by the Constituency Parties. It also passed resolutions warning the Party "against the danger of supporting anti-working-class forces in international affairs"; condemning policies which treated "the risings of the oppressed peoples as Soviet-inspired plots"; "strongly opposing any suggestion that the armaments now being built up to deter aggression should be employed to impose on any other country changes in government or internal policies".

In 1953 the N.E.C. foreign policy resolution adopted at the Margate Conference re-affirmed these Morecambe decisions. But meanwhile the right-wing Labour leaders in Parliament waged a campaign to make the Party support the rearmament and

inclusion in N.A.T.O. of Western Germany. This they succeeded in doing by knife-edge majorities in the Parliamentary Party and at Annual Conference. The resulting dissension and demoralisation in the Party were major factors in its defeat in the 1955 election.

By the 1957 Conference the issue of the H-bomb and nuclear weapons had become a major source of controversy in the Party. The Left suffered a heavy defeat because of the reversal of his position on this matter by Aneurin Bevan, in a vain attempt to preserve Party unity without abandoning the H-bomb. But at the same time a progressive foreign policy resolution was passed which was the joint product of the National Union of Mineworkers and the Amalgamated Engineering Union.

Nevertheless, after a spirited fight, the Conference was induced by the right-wing leaders to accept their report on *Industry and Society*. This report, as often in similar documents, had adopted a good deal of the Left's analysis, but drawn the conclusions of the Right; it showed how the British economy was dominated by 600 giant firms, but it drew the conclusion that the next Labour Government should not ask for a mandate to carry out any fresh measures of nationalisation, although it should have powers to buy shares in private firms and to nationalise any industry which had "failed the nation".

At this Conference the criticism by some trade unions, notably the Transport and General Workers' Union of which Frank Cousins is the Secretary, of the attitude to socialism of the right-wing leaders of the Party first made itself felt. The condition on which the unions were prepared to accept the report on *Industry and Society* was that the leadership should re-pledge itself to the nationalisation of steel and of long-distance transport, the two industries denationalised by the Tories.

At the 1958 Annual Conference in Scarborough the National Executive's new statement on foreign policy was adopted almost unanimously. It provided for the unification of Germany within a framework agreed and guaranteed by the four great powers, leaving the ways and means to be settled by the Germans themselves, and accompanied by withdrawal of foreign forces, banning of nuclear weapons, and the negotiation of an all-European security treaty. The countries in the zone of disengagement—a united Germany, Poland, Czechoslovakia and Hungary—should cease to be members of N.A.T.O. and the Warsaw Pact. The Four Powers were further to co-operate in supervising these agreements and establishing international control in a convention for limiting and reducing armaments throughout this area.

The policy called for China to be accorded her seat in the Security Council as an essential preliminary to a Far Eastern settlement, and asserted that Quemoy and the other off-shore islands are part of the mainland of China and should be restored to the People's Republic forthwith.

At the same time this policy maintained "support for N.A.T.O. as a regional system of defence" while declaring that the United Nations remained "the keystone of Labour's foreign policy", and must be strengthened.

Speaking to this resolution at the Conference, I said I would support it because although it contained mistakes of fact and confusion of thought, it would when put forward by a Labour Government prove broadly acceptable to the Soviet Government as a basis of negotiation.

"The central feature of this new policy of ours . . . is that we have decided at long last to co-operate with the Soviet Union and China on the basis of the United Nations Charter. As Nye (Bevan) told us this morning we have an overwhelming common interest with the Soviet Union in preserving peace. As Nye has told us on other occasions communism is a social challenge, not a military threat, and the Soviet Union does in fact want peace, and does not want war. That is a view which I believe is held by the overwhelming majority of the Labour Party.

"But now that we have at last decided, and rightly decided, to base our foreign policy on the assumption that the Soviet Union wants peace and that we can therefore co-operate with it on the basis of the Charter, why does the N.E.C. persist in basing our defence policy on the Tory assumption that the Soviet Union wants war? What is the use of military alliances and nuclear weapons against a country that we ourselves say wants peace, that we ourselves say is a country which we must co-operate with in the United Nations in order to preserve peace? Does that make sense? Of course, it does not make sense."

At the 1958 Conference about 750,000 of the 1,100,000 constituency Party votes[1] were cast for a policy of unilateral renunciation of nuclear weapons, but the leadership remained intransigent about the need for Britain having nuclear weapons of her own, and Mr. John Strachey, former Labour Minister of Defence, published a pamphlet, given semi-official status in an introduction by Mr. Gaitskell, claiming that having nuclear warheads, Britain was a nuclear power which could pursue an independent policy in the framework of N.A.T.O. (It is worth noting that were it not for the resistance from the Left in the Party's N.E.C. this pamphlet might have become an official document.)

By the first half of 1959 it became clear that the programme of the non-Party but, in fact, mostly left, Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament, was spreading so rapidly in the Constituency Parties and the trade unions, that it might win a majority at Annual Conference in the autumn. (This conference, it should be recalled, was not held because of the General Election.) The conversion of the giant Transport and General Workers' Union to this view created this situation. When the extreme right-wing National Union of Municipal and General Workers followed suit, there was consternation at Transport House. A "new" policy was rushed out which said that Britain should offer to renounce her own nuclear weapons so soon as all other countries except the U.S.A. and U.S.S.R. were prepared to renounce any claim to make or possess them, and to join in a system of international control to see that they had none. It was pointed out by the Left that this was a tongue-in-cheek policy statement.

In the election the Tories attacked *Industry and Society* because it had asked for powers to nationalise any industry which had "failed the nation", without asking a mandate to nationalise anything in particular except steel and long-distance transport, which the trade unions had insisted upon. The strategy of the *Industry and Society* report was intended to satisfy the socialists in the Labour Party, by pointing to the powers to nationalise everything, while reassuring the floating voters by explaining that the report did not commit us to nationalise anything but the above-mentioned branches. The Tories reversed this—first they scared the floating voters by painting a frightening picture of the Labour Party as extremists and Reds who would stop at nothing to nationalise the whole place. Then the right-wing leaders in defending themselves against the dreadful charge of being socialists, took the heart out of the rank and file militants in the Party and sank the socialist vote.

On top of that the Tories pressed the question how Labour would pay for the expanding social services and the better education, housing and health programme which we were offering the people, without inflation or raising taxation. The Right had no convincing answer because for years they had evaded the attempts of the Left to make them come out bluntly and say they would cut the huge defence burden unilaterally as much as was necessary to carry out our home policy.

Finally, Mr. Macmillan, since Labour's leader had refused a previous invitation, stole a march on Labour by visiting Moscow and calling for a Summit Conference, and was able to go into the elections with the aura of a peace-maker, although in fact he had no policy for making peace, and was in any case firmly tied to American leading strings. The election defeat—the third in succession with an ever-rising number of votes and seats lost—was a shock. It is driving the Right in the Party more to the Right and the Left more to the Left with the Centre and rank and file moving towards the Left.

For the conclusions drawn by the brilliant young Keynesian economists and close associates of Gaitskell, such as Douglas Jay and Anthony Crosland, were that Labour must cease being a socialist Party even in name, change its name, drop the nationalisation of steel and revise or scrap Clause 4 in its Constitution which pledges it to socialism. This Clause reads: "To secure for the workers by hand or by brain the full fruits of their industry and the most equitable distribution thereof that may be possible upon the basis of the common ownership of the means of production, distribution, and exchange, and the best obtainable system of popular administration and control of each industry or service." Crosland's theoretical justification of this line is that the "managed capital-

[1] Representation at Annual Conferences is usually in excess of the Party's real numerical strength since each incomplete thousand of votes cast during election of delegates from particular organisation is counted as complete.

ism" of our day is capable of providing full employment and rising standards of living for all. That is why, we are told, it is not necessary to bind the Labour movement to the interests of the working class alone.

The row over Clause 4 of the Constitution really got started when Mr. Gaitskell in the extraordinary post-election inquest conference held at Blackpool at the end of November, 1959, gave an analysis which was a toned-down version of what was said by Crosland and Jay, and also advocated a revision of Clause 4. "This clause," said Gaitskell, "laid us open to continual misrepresentation. It implies that common ownership is an end whereas in fact it is a means. It implies that the only precise object we have is nationalisation whereas in fact we have many other socialist objectives. It implies that we propose to nationalise everything, but do we? . . . .We have long come to accept for the foreseeable future in some form, a mixed economy."

Frank Cousins, in a very blunt speech, answered that whereas there could be nationalisation without socialism, there could be no socialism without nationalisation. Barbara Castle, Chairman of the Conference, in her opening address, had answered in advance the argument that nationalisation lost us votes in the election by saying that it was the Labour Party's own fault for not having presented the real case for socialism, or producing policies for correcting the faults of the existing nationalised industries. "To say," she observed, "that the State should acquire shares in private industry on the strict understanding that it exercised no control over it, is like legalising the burglar's union on condition that we share the swag." These facts and the results of the voting indicated that the Conference decisively rejected the attempts of Mr. Gaitskell and his closest political and personal associates to swing the Labour Party to the Right.

Anuerin Bevan, the Deputy Leader of the Party, averted what might have been a major clash and a split then and there in an extremely skilful speech where he, however, came down quite firmly for socialism in the sense of a publicly-owned and operated economic system as the over-riding purpose which Labour exists to achieve, and as an indispensable means to build the kind of equalitarian co-operative fraternal society we want.

The National Executive, in the middle of March, after long discussions, produced a statement which began by quoting the Party objectives, including Clause 4 as set forth in the 1918 Constitution, and then "re-affirming, amplifying and clarifying them" in the light of postwar developments and the achievements of the Labour Government. In the main this is merely an explanation of the old Constitution and acceptable to the whole Party. Paragraph (j), however, which explains Clause 4, reads as follows:

"It is convinced that these social and economic objectives can be achieved only through an expansion of common ownership substantial enough to give the community power over the commanding heights of the economy. Common ownership takes varying forms, including state-owned industries and firms, producer and consumer co-operation, municipal ownership, and public participation in private concerns. Recognising that both public and private enterprise have a place in the economy, it believes that further extension of common ownership should be decided from time to time in the light of these objectives and according to circumstances, with due regard for the views of the workers and consumers concerned."

The N.E.C.'s declaration was in the nature of a compromise. It showed that the Party rejected the Right-wing orientation of the leaders. But at the same time it reflected the anxiety of the rank and file to preserve Party unity at all costs and their unreadiness to follow the Left in a final show-down with the Party's Right-wing leadership, by insisting on a clear-cut and unequivocal stand on the two major issues of socialism and peace—and on the inseparable connection between them. That left only a continuation of the ambiguous compromises and rubber formulae, plastering over irreconcilable differences for the sake of a show of unity, that had been the curse of the Party for the last four elections.

The N.E.C.'s declaration was accordingly a heavy defeat in substance for the Right-wing leaders. But at the same time it saved their faces by introducing a wide measure of ambiguity and "elasticity" into the formation of the crucial paragraph "J". But the unionists and Constituency Labour parties instinctively felt that the N.E.C. declaration was an attempt of the Right to emasculate the Party's socialist spirit. By June a large majority of Party members had already lined up for the pure and simple rejection of the N.E.C.'s declaration and maintenance of Clause 4 of the Constitution as it stands. As a

result the N.E.C. publicly announced its intention to ask the forthcoming Annual Conference to approve its declaration. Instead it will appear in the National Executive's report to Conference as a guide to the interpretation of Clause 4. But it seems probable that there will be a majority at Conference in favour of referring this section of its report back to the N.E.C. for further consideration. This is a polite way of rejecting the declaration. In August the N.E.C. published a report by the General Secretary of the Party, Mr. Morgan Phillips, entitled *Labour in the Sixties* which carried the struggle one stage further. The following extracts give an idea of the tenor of its argument:

"In the past, of course, there were fierce debates within the Party. They were, however, mainly about the pace of our advance towards a socialist society; the enthusiasts pressing for accelerated progress, the more cautious emphasising the difficulties involved and the need always to carry the nation with us. What has distinguished our recent debates, however, is a widespread belief that disagreements are not now about pace but about direction. . . .

"What many people missed [in Labour's election programme—*K.Z.*] was a framework of principle to give unity and purpose and a sense of mission to its list of workaday reforms. Secondly, in its impact on the public it lacked a critique of modern Britain sufficiently sharp and coherent to drive home, through the confusions of rapid change, the underlying problems of our age. Only when the British people see a clear difference of principle dividing Tories from Labour will they lose their reluctance to vote for a change. . . .

"What the Party needs today is . . . a clear statement both of our distinctive attitude to postwar capitalism and of the new direction we would give the nation's affairs. Our claim to office is not just that we can manage things better than the Conservatives, but that we aim to create a different and better society. . . .

"The central feature of our postwar capitalist society is the scientific revolution. . . . This scientific revolution has made it physically possible, for the first time in human history, to conquer poverty and disease, to move towards universal literacy and to achieve living standards for the masses far higher than those enjoyed by tiny privileged classes in previous epochs. The central issue of politics throughout the world today is not merely how the new riches shall be distributed within and between the nations but—just as important—how the new powers and energies now released by science shall be controlled.

"Throughout the Western world the Conservative parties maintain that control of the scientific revolution can safely be left to a largely unregulated system of free enterprise . . . and public enterprise and community services must be content with what is left over when the requirements of private profit-making are satisfied. . . . As a result, our Western societies reveal an astonishing contrast between private wealth and public squalor. . . .

"We, by contrast, assert that the great decisions which determine economic and social development must be made by a Government accountable to the people's elected representatives. . . . This must be the central theme of the crusade we launch, the thread which binds together our specific policies and proposals. . . .

"When our opponents claim that socialism is outdated and must be scrapped, they are flying in the face of the facts. On the contrary, our Socialist beliefs will be vindicated in the 1960's, as it is ever more clearly seen that the new postwar capitalism is creating its own insuperable problems and that, in the epoch of scientific revolution, democracy, if it is to survive, must plan its resources for the common good. . . ."

It will be seen that the Morgan Phillips report on socialism, expressing views of the Centre, is at variance with what the right leaders think. His ideas will certainly commend themselves to the great majority of the Party. But on the literally life and death issue of international affairs the report contains nothing but a few brief generalities about "working to strengthen the United Nations and extend its work as a guardian of peace and an institution for economic co-operation."

The report further says: "The human race now has the choice between blowing itself to pieces in national wars and rising above the limitations of sovereignty to create a world community with unlimited possibilities of free development. . . . In the 1960's the choice lies between international anarchy, international communism and international socialism."

The report closely follows the reasoning of the pamphlet by R. H. S. Crossman, M.P. and member of the N.E.C., entitled *The Affluent Society*. Mr. Crossman agrees with the

Right in accepting the nuclear deterrent stategy, N.A.T.O. and U.S. bases in Britain. Therefore his pamphlet says nothing about the reliance of latter-day capitalism on war preparations as the handiest if not the only way to stave off chronic unemployment. From the point of view of the Left in the Labour Party, both R. H. S. Crossman and Morgan Phillips fail to attack capitalism at its weakest point, which is the sheer economic waste of the defence expenditure, which absorbs the money and resources necessary for expanding production and social services, and largely accounts for the constant danger of inflation. This is directly due to Mr. Crossman's belief in the necessity for N.A.T.O. and armaments. He is obviously prepared to see the cold war go on.

By combining tacit acceptance of the cold war and the nuclear deterrent strategy with verbal dedications to socialism, the "Centre" of the N.E.C. hope to satisfy the rank and file while avoiding a show-down with the Right-wing leaders. For the latter are prepared to swallow any amount of defeat and humiliation on the issue of socialism, since they believe in the next two or three years it will not arise in a sufficiently concrete form in debate in the House to embarrass them.

But in every debate on defence, disarmament or foreign policy they will have either to take their stand or to break with the decisions of the forthcoming Conference, which to all appearance will reject the nuclear deterrent strategy. The Tories, who are as terrified as the Right-wing Labour leaders, openly support and urge them to fight to the last on this issue, as great statesmen and patriots. But they would turn and rend their Labour *protégés* if they gave way. So that it is in this field that the decisive battle will be fought in the Labour Party.

This battle has already been as good as lost by the Right. Since the election the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament has been spreading so fast in the Constituency Parties and the trade unions as to spur the N.E.C. into a new defence policy statement. This statement renounces the illusion so long cherished by the Right-wing leadership that Britain was or could be taken seriously by the United States as a nuclear power, and accepts the position in N.A.T.O. that the United States has the monopoly of nuclear weapons. Quite meaningfully, the statement is mum about U.S. bases in Britain with the exception of the "Thor" rockets. It insists on scrapping these bases but the "Thor" rockets have long been out of date. But at the same time the Right-wing leaders again put forward all kinds of bright ideas—collective control of U.S. nuclear weapons by N.A.T.O., adopting a predominantly "non-nuclear" strategy for N.A.T.O., undertaking never to resort to (American) nuclear weapons first, etc. They even say that "the United Nations must be made the keystone for British foreign policy". But they add that we must remain "loyal supporters of N.A.T.O." because the world is divided into rival blocs!

To this the Left is replying by pointing out that Mr. Gaitskell himself declared only a few months ago that to remain in N.A.T.O. on the basis of the United States having a monopoly of nuclear weapons, would mean we could not carry out our own foreign policy. States which believe they must be protected by American nuclear power will have to accept whatever terms the U.S.A. exacts for its protection—it is not for them to tell the United States what it should or should not do with its nuclear weapons.

The Left believe that Britain should scrap our nuclear strategy and "positions of strength" policy in relation to the Soviet Union, which we pursue to please the United States. If we really are to "conduct our relations with other countries in accordance with the letter and spirit of the Charter", to quote the statement, we must take the view that neither side wants to attack the other, the real danger is of war arising from an inadvertent clash between the rival military systems, and the way to diminish and ultimately end that danger is disarmament, disengagement, and East-West co-operation through an all-European treaty on the basis of the U.N. Charter. To show that we mean business with that policy we must not only renounce the illusion that we are or can be a nuclear power, but also clear out the American bases, and apply the principle to N.A.T.O. that we refuse to be committed to war by our allies who will not come to terms with us on how to make peace.

The agenda of the annual Conference in October contains 161 resolutions on defence. Of these four more or less support the policy of sticking to the nuclear deterrent strategy and "negotiation from strength" policy embodied in N.A.T.O. and necessitating the maintenance of U.S. bases on British soil. The remaining 157 demand the rejection of the nuclear deterrent strategy, an end to the manufacture or possession by Britain of

nuclear weapons, and the removal of U.S. bases from British territory. Thirty-five of them draw the logical conclusion and demand that Britain should leave N.A.T.O. The number of Trades Union votes already committed to this position by the end of August was 2,900,000, to which must be added at least 70 per cent of the votes of the Constituency Labour parties—about 700,000—making a total of 3,600,000 in all. As against this, there were by that date only 1,800,000 T.U. and 300,000 C.L.P. votes committed to supporting the official policy. This still leaves some ¾ million unaccounted for. But even if all of them voted for the N.E.C. declaration—and nothing is more unlikely—it would receive less than 3 million votes as against over 3,600,000.

It should be said that on the issue of socialism, too, the Party feels no less radically: out of the thirty-two resolutions submitted but one supports the N.E.C.'s declaration while others reject it and favour the maintenance of Clause 4 of the Constitution as it stands.

But the right-wing leaders will fight to the last ditch. They have not quite abandoned hope of inducing a right-wing T.U. leader to vote against the mandate given him by his union. But feeling is running so high on this issue and the mandates are so clear and fresh that the risk now appears excessive to the leaders concerned. Some of them assume that Conference could be induced to vote "emotionally" for a resolution rejecting the nuclear deterrent strategy and "rationally" for the N.E.C. policy supporting it. But this assumption cynically underestimates the intelligence of the rank and file. It stands reality on its head by ascribing "reason" to the sheer suicidal madness of a policy that could immolate the British people on the altar of Pentagon brinkmanship, and dismissing as "emotional" those who prefer human survival to genocide.

The right-wing leaders' last line of defence seems to be to advance the novel doctrine that the Parliamentary Party is entirely independent and needs pay no regard to Conference decisions. But there seems little chance of rallying the majority of either the Annual Conference, or the Parliamentary Party, or even of the N.E.C. to this view. On the contrary, the whole power of the desire for Party unity through loyalty to majority decisions will at some point swing against the right-wing leaders, and those who will not or cannnot accept the new policy will either have to resign or fail to be re-elected.

The growing strength of the Left in this long fight is due to the fact that reality and time are on our side: the failure of the nuclear deterrent strategy (which assumed the invulnerability of the U.S.A. and its "decisive" superiority in nuclear weapons to the U.S.S.R.) is complete and with it the hopelessness of the "negotiation from strength" policy. The meaning of the presence of U.S. bases in Britain was brought home to the people by U.S. Secretary of Defence Thomas Gates' eve-of-the-Summit Conference alert (when a few hundred fighters and bombers, some carrying A-bombs, were put into the air from U.S. bases in Britain, without even notifying the British Government); the U-2 spy flight that wrecked the Summit Conference, followed by the RB-47 reconnaissance flight from a British base.

The "national" sore points with British public opinion are the U.S. bases and the rearmament of Germany. The sheer criminal folly of reviving a policy which led to the Second World War, of relying on German nationalism, militarism and even fascism as a "bulwark against communism", is becoming all too obvious. The dismay and anger at the demand of ex-Nazi Generals for nuclear weapons, and the unpopularity of Adenauer's Germany in Britain would be difficult to exaggerate. The Labour Party is strongly officially and unitedly opposed to the arming of Germany with nuclear weapons, although this unity only formally includes the right-wing leaders who want to make an ally of Western Germany.

The defeat of the near Tories in the Labour Party will be followed by an all-in fight on basic home and world issues between Labour and the real Tories in the country. For what is at stake is nothing less than the survival of capitalism. N.A.T.O. is an integral part of the defence of the old order. The arms race is the social insurance policy of capitalism. The cold war is the anti-socialist opium of the people. Without both the economic need and political demand for a sweeping advance to socialism would become irresistible. This cannot but frighten the Tories. *Hinc illae lacrimae.*

The Left in the Labour Party has been hammering home their lesson for a long time that the fight for socialism and the fight for peace are ultimately inseparable, and that friendly relations with the Communist parties ruling the socialist states are part and parcel of a policy of peaceful co-existence and a pre-condition for success in doing our job at home.

The Left Socialists and their Role in the Labour Movement

ERWIN SCHARF

IN recent times the journals, trends and organisations which can be defined as "Left Socialist" have gained ground among the Social Democrats in the capitalist world. In *France*, for example, the Autonomous Socialist Party, formed by the opponents of Guy Mollet, who had withdrawn previously from the French Socialist Party (SFIO), and some other Left groups agreed last April to establish the United Socialist Party which today numbers some 25,000 members. In *Belgium* many prominent Socialists have united around the weekly *La Gauche* (The Left). Left Socialists in France, such as Depreux, Rosenfeld and others, also contribute to this journal. In *Britain* the Left in the Labour Party have entered the lists against the Right-wing leaders who want the Party to repudiate both socialism and nationalisation. In *Western Germany* the Left trends are making headway in Social Democratic trade unions, in student societies and other youth organisations. Men who have been expelled or who have left the Social Democratic Party such as Dr. Victor Agartz, trade union expert, Dr. Gerhard Gleissberg, former editor of *Vorwarts*, and others are particularly active. These men are associated with *Die andere Zeitung*, *Periodikum* and *Korrespondenz fur Wirtschafts- und Sozialwissenschaften* and other Left publications. In *Italy* the Socialist Party, ever since 1934, had supported united action with the Communists and had fought for an international détente. This political line took shape in the struggle against the Rights in the Italian socialist movement who, in 1947, when they discovered they could no longer dominate the Party, left it and formed a break-away Social Democratic Party. Recent years have seen a noticeable swing toward opportunism in the leadership of the Socialist Party, which has renounced the policy of unity with the Communist Party. Still, Socialist-Communist co-operation is being carried on in the mass organisations, particularly in the trade unions, in the political struggle. The general strike in July that swept away the Tambroni government is proof of this. A considerable section of Socialists has remained loyal to the Left policy. The resolution submitted by the Left to the last Party congress had the approval of about a third of the membership. The Lefts are represented on the same scale on the Executive Committee. In *Austria* the Lefts were expelled from the Socialist Party because they rejected the anti-Soviet line of the leadership and favoured co-operation with the Communists, friendship with the Soviet Union, and Austrian neutrality. In 1949 they formed an organisation of their own which in 1950 became the Socialist Workers' Party (Left Socialists). This Party fought alongside the Communists in the economic and political struggles of the working class. After the conclusion of the State Treaty it decided, at its extraordinary Congress in 1956, to merge with the Communist Party. But even in the Socialist Party the policy of the leadership comes in for criticism from the Left. Criticism has been voiced by Hindels, Marz, Massiczek and others. In *Finland* the Left Social Democrats headed by Skog and Simonen parted company with Tanner and Leskinen and established in 1959 a Social Democratic Union of Workers and Smallholders. In *Japan* there is a leftward shift in the Socialist Party. But as was the case with the Italian Socialist Party, a Right wing broke away from it in January 1960. The Japanese Socialists enjoy considerable prestige among the working people and have a big influence in the Sohyo, the main trade union body with a membership of 3,600,000. There are 67 Socialist deputies in the Upper Chamber and 124 in the Lower House. In South America the Socialist parties in *Chile*, *Ecuador* and *Uruguay* are more to the Left. In *Argentina*, along with the Right Socialists there is also a Socialist Party which on a number of issues takes a Left stand.

We have enumerated here only the more influential of the Left Socialist groups, but there are Left trends in the Social Democratic parties of many other countries. The Communists, naturally, are interested in these developments which are quite important for the working-class movement.

Social Democrats in the New Situation

In the 'thirties the victory of fascism and the defeat of the working-class and democratic movements in some of the European countries had the effect of a flash of lightning, which made clear to many workers that the anti-communism and anti-Soviet policy of the Right-wing leaders of international social democracy signified a mortal danger to the working class, because it split its ranks in the face of the fascist menace.

The realisation by the Social Democrats loyal to socialist ideals of the mistakes made, the selflessness displayed by the Communists in the anti-fascist struggle, the identity of interests in this struggle—these were the factors which during the Second World War united the Communists and Social Democrats in most European countries, and in some of them even before the war. The alliance of the working-class parties was the core of the anti-fascist Resistance Movement in the Nazi-occupied countries. Unity took shape not only in the partisan groups but also in the prisons and concentration camps. In those days even avowed anti-communists among the Social Democrats such as Saragat in Italy and Guy Mollet in France swore by working-class unity.

Shortly after the war, however, the Social Democratic leaders in Western Europe repudiated unity agreements, and confused their rank and file with fables about "Soviet imperialism" and "Moscow agents". From this it was but a step to collaboration with the bourgeoisie on the pattern of a horse and rider, with the bourgeoisie in the role of rider spurring on the Social Democratic horse in the chosen direction, trampling on the interests of the working class.

This turn on the part of West European social democracy cannot be explained solely by dishonesty and the bourgeois outlook of its leaders; it also had definite social reasons. The better conditions won after the war gave rise to reformist illusions among some sections of the working people. The boom and high level of employment in most West European countries led many Social Democratic workers to believe that capitalism had changed for the better. Another reason was that considerable numbers of young people—many of them of petty-bourgeois origin—with no experience of class struggle, came to the factories; these young workers accepted the democratic gains as a guarantee of their interests, and saw no special reason for political struggle. Reformist ideology was brought into the working-class movement also by people from the milieu of the middle sections who had taken to politics. These developments could not but affect the Social Democratic parties whose leaders, with renewed vigour, sang the praises of reformism, spicing it with an anti-communist flavouring. They made full use of the cold war, which cleared the way for unrestricted anti-communist propaganda and prevented the spread of truth about the Soviet Union.

But in recent years the symptoms of a new crisis have been making themselves felt in the Social Democratic parties. It is true, of course, that internal troubles have been fermenting in these parties ever since the October Revolution in Russia. At crucial moments the fermentation always comes to the surface. And this is the case now. The governing capitalist circles who styled themselves previously defenders of democracy, are now vigorously intensifying their exploitation of the working people, and are bent on wiping out the democratic gains of the Resistance. It is becoming clear that only resolute struggle against the monopolies by the people in the capitalist countries can save democracy. The new sections of the proletariat are daily gaining more and more experience of class struggle. In summing up these processes it can be said that the antagonism between the bourgeoisie and the working class, obscured by the capitalists and the Right-wing Social Democrats for quite a long time, is forcing its way into the open. This cannot but sap the very pillars of the reformist policies.

On the other hand, the prestige of the Communist parties and the popularity of their ideas have grown. Since the Twentieth Congress of the C.P.S.U., which put forward the thesis about the different roads to socialism, the absurdity of the slanders about the "hand of Moscow" has become particularly obvious. The Communist parties are developing Marxist-Leninist teaching on the forms of transition to socialism, as they apply to the specific conditions in each country. By their part in the recent struggles against the resurgence of fascism and in support of democratic liberties in Italy, Japan and other countries, the Communists have again demonstrated that, far from seeking to destroy democracy, they are its staunchest defenders.

The nonsense about "Soviet imperialism" has also become obvious. Having achieved military superiority over the United States, the Soviet Union, far from talking about war, is working with redoubled energy for a détente, for banishing war for all time, and for general and complete disarmament.

The rubbish about the bad plight of the Soviet working people has been exposed. Reading with admiration about the achievements of Soviet science and technology, observing the flights of the Sputniks and space rockets, meeting the working people—the masters of the land of socialism—during the visits to the Soviet Union, hearing about the introduction of the six- and seven-hour working day and the abolition of taxes, workers everywhere feel that only socialism can provide the people with security and a future. One of the biggest

antidotes to the baneful influence of reformism is the fact that even today the standard of living of the Soviet worker will stand comparison with that of the worker in any of the leading capitalist countries, and this despite the fact that before the Revolution Russia ranked among the most backward countries. With the completion of the current seven-year plan the Soviet Union will rank among the countries with the highest living standards.

And while the light radiated by the Soviet Union and the world communist movement is dispelling the gloomy anti-communist shadows created by the propaganda of the bourgeoisie and the Right-wing Social Democrats, these gentlemen are themselves losing ground as a result of their own policy. The subordination to imperialist interests has cost the Social Democratic parties a series of electoral defeats in Britain, France, Western Germany, the Netherlands, etc. One would think that the Social Democratic leaders would draw conclusions from this concerning the need to abandon their anti-communism and the alliance with the bourgeoisie.

This is far from being the case. For them the opportunities for the advance to socialism in the new situation are more of a danger than a help. They refuse quite definitely now to do anything to change the capitalist system, regarding themselves openly and cynically as a part of the capitalist state, differing only in tactics from the bourgeois parties. Accordingly they are at particular pains to root out as far as possible the traditions of class struggle and to place the working class completely under the thumb of the bourgeoisie. The old programmes which mentioned the need for socialism are declared outmoded and replaced by new documents extolling the virtues of capitalism and portraying a socialist system without private ownership of the means of production as a utopia. Anti-communism and anti-Sovietism are now the common platform of the Right-wing Social Democrats and the bourgeois parties. And this identity with the bourgeoisie is described by Dr. Bruno Kreisky, deputy chairman of the Austrian Socialist Party, as "synchronising the programme with reality"!

The switching of the Right leaders of the Social Democratic parties to the standpoint of the imperialist bourgeoisie and, in contrast, socialism's growing appeal among the rank-and-file Socialists have caused a differentiation in these parties—the deepest, perhaps, since the break-away forty years ago which resulted in the emergence of the international communist movement. Although because of tradition and illusions most of the Social Democrats still follow the Right-wing leaders, their anti-capitalist sentiment and their desire for socialism are unmistakable. This is the explanation for the appearance of the Left in the Social Democratic parties.

Ideology and Policy of the Left Socialists

It is extremely difficult to say clearly and exactly which leaders and groups in the Social Democratic movement should be regarded as belonging to the Left. One reason for this is that quite often particular groups parade as "Leftist" solely for the sake of popularity. A case in point was the group in Saragat's Social Democratic Party headed by Matteotti and Zagari which, parading their "Leftism", demonstratively withdrew from the Party eighteen months ago. In reality they adhered to the same principles as Saragat and sought but the semblance of "independence" from the bourgeoisie. When they entered Nenni's Socialist Party, the group gravitated, naturally, to its Right wing. Another reason is that those organisations which can justly be described as Left Socialist differ among themselves greatly in their attitude to many of the basic issues of the day. The attitude of the Lefts in the British Labour Party, for example, is much less definite and progressive than that of the Italian Lefts. In the sphere of international policy the Left Socialists in Japan are more in line with the interests of the working-class movement than, say, the Left Social Democrats in Western Germany. These differences are explained by the different historical and social conditions and, in particular, by the situation in the social democratic and communist movements in the given country. The stronger the Communist Party and the closer its contact with the masses, the more progressive the attitude, as a rule, of the Left Socialists and the greater their influence on the working-class movement.

Still, some common features in the ideology and policy of the Left Socialists can be singled out.

On the great issue of our times—capitalism or socialism—they stand four-square for socialism. And this fact should take pride of place in any assessment of their views. This is especially important today when the Right Socialists hold up as the ideal the so-called Welfare State in which private ownership of the means of production is preserved. True,

not all the Lefts appreciate that socialism can be achieved only as a result of uncompromising class struggle. With their petty-bourgeois idea of socialism they often see it solely as democratic liberties—freedom of speech, freedom of the press, etc., forgetful that these freedoms can be guaranteed only by the revolutionary reconstruction of the economic and political pillars of society.

Nevertheless the Lefts are sharply critical of the Right wing for running away from socialism. Hindels, one of the Lefts in the Socialist Party of Austria, in a pamphlet entitled *Socialism Will Not Come of Itself*, writes: "Socialists who cannot imagine a classless society or who see in it only the realisation of the inevitable, are a long way from being Socialists." At its Extraordinary Congress in March 1960, the Socialist Party of Japan endorsed theses criticising the new programme of the West German Social Democrats which has become the gospel of the "mixed economy" advocates.

In addition to criticising the Right-wing opportunists the Lefts also make positive proposals. The Belgian weekly *La Gauche* writes: "It is our conviction that in order to build a new society it will be necessary to take away from big capital its material, political and economic power, a power which is a corrupting factor." Hence the resistance to the flight of the Rights from nationalisation and, objectively, support for democratic forces fighting to curb the monopolies. Upholding the working-class character of the Social Democratic parties the Lefts, for example in Britain, are resisting the efforts of Gaitskell and his friends to turn the Labour Party into an "organisation for all"—for capitalists as well as workers.

Of no less significance is the fact that most of the Lefts recognise the antagonistic character of the social system in their countries and deride the nonsense about the "changed nature of capitalism" spread by the reformist leaders. Prof. Itauro Sakisaka, Japanese Left Socialist, said in this respect that capitalist society is composed of "two basic classes", the capitalists and the proletariat, and it is only through a struggle between the two that "the fundamental differences in present-day society can be eliminated".

Deriding the bourgeois talk about the abolition of classes and the class struggle, talk repeated by the Right-wing Social Democrats, the Lefts counter the poisonous idea of "class peace" and help to deepen socialist consciousness.

The Lefts are against unscrupulous collaboration with the bourgeois parties. In Italy, for example, the Left Socialists have done much to frustrate the designs to turn the Socialist Party into a pillar of the existing system. The Finnish Social Democratic Union of Workers and Smallholders has denounced in its official documents the deal concluded between the Tanner leadership and the Coalition Party, a very reactionary bourgeois group.

But when it comes to the ways and means of transition to socialism the Lefts are far from being homogeneous. The difference in attitudes in this respect is revealed most strikingly in their approach to Marxism. The Italian Lefts, for example, accept Marxism-Leninism as a whole, including the teaching on the dictatorship of the proletariat. They abide by the behests of their leader Rodolfo Morandi who said: "As far as ideology is concerned we unreservedly accept Leninism, the Leninist interpretation and development of Marxism." In Western Germany the Lefts, while styling themselves Marxists, simultaneously deny Leninism, saying it is applicable only to the underdeveloped countries. In Britain most of the Lefts do not regard themselves as Marxists.

But generally speaking, it should be said that many Left Socialists are trying seriously to apply some of the theses of Marxism. Their statements to this effect cannot be disregarded by the world communist movement especially in view of the massive drive launched by the bourgeoisie and Right-wing Social Democrats against Marxism.

Politically this attitude impels most of the Lefts to ally themselves with the forces fighting for socialism and to oppose capitalist reaction. In practice this means that many of them favour co-operation with the Communists and sharply criticise imperialist policy, and the policy of the U.S. Government in the first place. In France, for example, at the founding congress of the United Socialist Party voices were heard calling for contact with the Communist Party. The draft declaration on the establishment of the Party proclaimed united action with the Communists against the war in Algeria as a basic task. The Seventeenth Congress of the Socialist Party of Japan held last March recognised the "potential strength" of the Communists. The many obstacles which previously hindered co-operation between the Left Socialists and the Communists in Japan are now being overcome. The Italian Lefts regard Communist-Socialist co-operation in the mass organisations as an important gain for the working class and are defending it against attacks from the Right.

It also happens, on the other hand, that Left Socialists shun co-operation with the Communist Party. Moreover, some of their organisations and groups, while combating the Right-wing anti-communist leaders, themselves adhere to an anti-communist standpoint. Yet it is the Lefts more than anyone else who stand to lose from this. And "it is not just that this [anti-communism—*Ed.*] becomes the weapon which the Right uses against all progressive and Left forces," pointed out John Gollan at the Twenty-Sixth Congress of the British Communist Party in March 1959, "lack of unity leads to the absence of a mass movement, which is the only way in the long run to defeat the entrenched Right-wing machine."

The anti-communism of some of the Lefts is a manifestation of their sectarianism, of lack of contact with the masses. The Left Social Democrats tend to underrate the importance of winning the peasants, handicraftsmen and other middle sections to the side of the working class, and at times even prevent the unity of the workers regardless of their political views. In Belgium, for example, some Left Socialists are opposed to unity of action of the Communist and Socialist workers with members of the Catholic trade unions. In a number of countries (Western Germany, Sweden, etc.) the Lefts among the Social Democrats represent an intellectual trend rather than an organised section of the working-class movement. And when in these circumstances the Lefts petulantly insist on a "monopoly of prestige", a leading role in the working-class movement, while ignoring the Communist parties, they isolate themselves from the working people and, ultimately, pave the way to their own defeat. But wherever the Lefts maintain contact with the workers and abandon anti-communism, their organisation is strengthened and their actions acquire a more consistent, revolutionary character, and result in success (Japan, Italy, Chile, Ecuador, etc.).

As to the Lefts' attitude in the sphere of foreign policy, they have a rather considerable experience of struggle for peace, against U.S. imperialism. Japan's example is particularly indicative in this respect. In that county the Socialist Party made a big contribution to rallying the masses against the Japanese-U.S. security treaty, for closing the U.S. military bases, and in preventing the Eisenhower visit.

Most of the Lefts see in the Soviet Union a bulwark of peace and independence of the nations. Not only do they refuse support to U.S. foreign policy, they are against the Nenni policy of an "equal distance" between the blocs. This modified variation of the "third force" would signify a retreat from proletarian internationalism. That is why at the last meeting of the Central Committee of the Italian Socialist Party the Lefts vigorously opposed the "equal distance" idea. In a letter to the Central Committee forty-four Left Socialist members of Parliament wrote: ". . . By equating the responsibilities of the United States and the Soviet Union for the Summit breakdown the leadership of the Party (composed of Nenni supporters—*E. S.*) places on a par the policies of the U.S.S.R. and of the United States. It thereby ignores the fact that the decisive role in the Atlantic bloc is played by the spokesmen of imperialist interests. . . ."

These ideas are in consonance with those of the Chilean Socialists in matters of foreign policy. An editorial in one of the issues of their newspaper *Izquierda* reads: "We, as Socialists, should by no means regard the Soviet Union and the United States in the same light. . . . In the first country Marxism, despite possible criticisms, has performed a leap from revolutionary theory to revolutionary action, and Russia itself has passed from tsarist feudalism to worker-peasant control of political power. In the second country history has entrusted the leaders of capitalism with the melancholy mission of being the last defenders of a philosophical system and an economic structure which are in a state of obvious ideological and moral bankruptcy." The article went on to say: "the victorius future of our movement, of our Popular Action Front, and the destinies of world socialism depend in a very large measure on the vigour and progress of socialist construction in the East."

In Western Germany the Left Social Democrats Agartz, Gleisberg and others have criticised the Right-wing leadership for supporting Bonn's official propaganda against the U.S.S.R. and East European countries. Unlike the Right wing, who fear the German Democratic Republic much more than they fear Adenauer, the Lefts insist on a meeting between representatives of the two German States. It was under their pressure that the Board of the S.D.P.G. put forward at one time a plan for German settlement which precluded atomic arms in the Federal Republic and called for an all-German commission representative of the two States. This plan, it should be said, has now been rejected by the Right wing.

A certain inconsistency among the Lefts can be observed at times in matters of foreign policy. Their understanding of the measures undertaken by the Soviet Union is not always

sound, and they succumb to the mellifluous propaganda of the Wall Street harpies. But by and large they are sincerely working for a lessening of international tension.

As we see, though on the whole they are progressive, the views of the Left Socialists are inconsistent and contradictory. Correct assessments are accompanied at times by fantastic political aberrations. Indecision is also a regular feature. Not always do they switch from correct slogans to action, with the result that the slogans remain on paper. This is seen, for example, in their relations with the Right wing. In some Social Democratic parties the Lefts, often at crucial moments, enter into unprincipled compromise with the opportunists.

There is nothing surprising in this—it is explained by the fact that the views and policies of the Lefts are shaped under the impact of the two opposing forces—social-reformist ideology which is a modification of capitalist ideology, and the urge of the Social Democratic rank-and-file towards socialism, towards resolute struggle against the bourgeoisie.

The Communists and the Left Socialists

The attitude of the Communists towards the Left Socialists has undergone serious changes.

At the time of the rise of the Communist parties their members looked upon those who remained in the Social Democratic parties, including the Left wing, with warranted mistrust. The phrasemongering of the Lefts could but disorientate the working class, in which there was a cleavage of forces at that time.

Today the situation is fundamentally different from what it was in the 'twenties. At that time the Left Socialists, shielding themselves behind the screen of phrasemongering, were moving to the Right. Today, on the contrary, they are moving to the Left, reflecting the growing attraction of socialism among the Social Democratic masses. That is why the old yardsticks are no good in approaching the Lefts. What is essential now is to stress that the activity of the Lefts in the socialist and working-class movement is on the whole beneficial both to democracy and socialism.

It should be said also that the Communist parties have matured and are steadily gaining in strength. Therefore the issue today is no longer the differentiation inside the working-class movement, but its unity on the basis of united action by the Communist and Social Democratic parties.

". . . Co-operation with those circles of the socialist movement whose views on the forms of transition to socialism differ from ours," said Khrushchov at the Twentieth Congress of the C.P.S.U., "is also possible and essential." Co-operation with the Left Socialists is an element of this general task, an element of special importance. Actually it is much easier to come to an agreement on co-operation with the Lefts than with the Social Democratic parties as a whole.

The Communists, naturally, do not counterpose co-operation with the Lefts to co-operation with the social democratic movement as a whole. The point is that the Lefts are the first to grasp the hand of friendship which we extend to all sincere Social Democrats. Since the very inception of their parties the Communists have been resolute opponents of disunity and dissension in the working-class movement. Thus in 1956, when sharp contradictions set in between Rights and Lefts in the Italian Socialist Party and some members of the latter began to speak about the need of a split, the Communist Party emphatically stated that such a development would be a severe blow to the working-class movement.

The special importance of co-operation with the Left Socialists is the subject of discussion in many Communist parties. Lawrence Sharkey, General Secretary of the Communist Party of Australia, said in his report to the Eighteenth Congress in April 1958: "We set out and succeeded in improving our relationship with the Left and progressive elements within the A.L.P. and the trade union movement."

The Thirteenth Congress of the Communist Party of Belgium (April 1960) pointed out that "in the organisations of the Socialist Party there are deep Left trends" with which it is necessary to co-operate.

In the Soviet textbook *Foundations of Marxism-Leninism* written in accordance with the decision of the C.C. of the C.P.S.U. we read: "In all circumstances the Left Socialists can play their part in overcoming the division in the working-class movement. Although the Left Socialists often display political inconsistency, they are, nevertheless, the most progressive elements in the social democratic movement. . . . And the Communist parties are trying to help them overcome the prejudices instilled by the anti-communist splitters."

It is, of course, difficult to achieve comprehensive co-operation with the Left Socialists

all at once, though by virtue of the identity of views this co-operation is possible not only in the struggle for immediate aims—for peace, against fascism, for higher living standards—but also for more distant aims—for socialism. Co-operation usually begins in the joint struggle for a particular democratic demand and then it embraces the entire range of the policy and even the ideology. The Left Socialists, subjected to the revolutionising influence of the communist movement, are drawing closer to the Communists and, gradually, will shed their reformist illusions.

A useful experience of co-operation in the struggle for immediate economic and political demands has been gained, for instance, by the Socialists and Communists in Chile. For a number of years after the Second World War the working class in Chile was divided. There were two trade union bodies—one Communist, the other Socialist. Banking on the division of the proletariat, the governing circles made big inroads into its rights. Both the Socialists and the Communists were removed from the Government. Anti-communist laws deprived over three thousand activists (including many Socialists) of the right to hold posts in the unions, while union elections were placed under the control of the police and the Ministry of Labour. The standard of living declined sharply. Lastly, the policy of anti-communism resulted in a split in the Socialist Party and in repeated electoral defeats (in the 1946 presidential election its candidate polled a mere 12,000 votes). And only the unity of Communists and Socialists—first in the Popular Front and later in the more representative Popular Action Front—resulted in big successes for both parties. A United Trade Union Centre was established to which all the unions affiliated. This made it possible to conduct general strikes and to co-ordinate the strikers' actions; a brake was applied to the fall in wages. Democratic elections were re-established in the unions, the Communist Party regained legal status and the Socialist Party its unity. The Popular Action Front is growing stronger. At the last presidential elections in 1958 its candidate (a Socialist) polled 354,000 votes, only 34,000 votes less than was needed for victory. The working class has become the leading force of the movement for the independence of Chile.

As things are today, the international working-class movement is in a position to utilise more and more varied forms of the transition to socialism. The implementation by the Communist parties in the capitalist countries of their programmes which envisage a peaceful transition to socialism will add to the attractive power of communism so far as the Left Socialists are concerned. It is reasonable to suppose therefore that the next stage of the international working-class movement will be the unity of the Communists and Left Socialists, not only in defining the aims of the struggle against capitalism and for socialism, but also as to the forms of the struggle.

It goes without saying that to achieve this unity the "extended hand" policy is not enough. The Communists are obliged to safeguard Marxist-Leninist theory against all revisionist attacks and dogmatic distortions. While co-operating with the Left Socialists and with the Social Democratic parties as a whole, the Communists at the same time resolutely criticise all deviations from Marxism.

The effect of this criticism will be all the greater if it is couched in a constructive and friendly way, if it helps those who are confused. Palmiro Togliatti, General Secretary of the Italian Communist Party, speaking about the relations between the Communist and Socialist parties, said: "We must reject the attitude of the Socialist Party leaders, but we should do so in such a way that our criticism and our polemics with them, instead of raising new barriers between us, should, on the contrary, help to eliminate them." As an example of constructive Communist criticism of Left Socialist ideas we can point to the debate on the subject of workers' control in the theoretical circles of the Italian working-class movement. The Left Socialists Panzieri and Libertini worked out their concept about the possibility of establishing workers' control over the monopolies. The Communist paper *l'Unita* reprinted the Panzieri-Libertini letter and followed up with an article which subjected to friendly criticism the abstract presentation of the question and submitted the Communist viewpoint, the basis of which was the need to develop the struggle of the masses. Examples of this co-operation can be found also in other countries. Last year the Communists and Left Socialists in Japan combined in a venture to publish the works of Marx and Engels. Earlier in the spring, Marxist economists from the two parties formed a joint "economic theory society". Thanks to the efforts of the Communists, Marxism-Leninism is winning more supporters among the Japanese Socialists.

Some Communists reject the idea of broad co-operation with the Left Socialists, for example, in the struggle against reformism and revisionism, and try to justify their refusal

by invoking the ideological mistakes of the latter. But these mistakes can be brought to light and explained precisely in the process of the co-operation which depends above all on the skill of the Communists. To demand beforehand that Left Socialists should make no mistakes is highly unreasonable to say the least.

The communist movement is strong and should not, therefore, fear broad co-operation with the Left Socialists. A sectarian attitude, an attitude of fearing to have anything to do with the Left Socialist trends and parties can but harm the working class. At the same time by arranging friendly discussions we shall contribute to mutual understanding. In so doing we should repose greater trust in our best argument—the facts concerning the economic, political and cultural advance in the socialist countries—rely on strength of conviction emanating from this new world. Not of its own volition, however, but depending on the effort put in will the working-class movement arrive at solidarity on specific issues and then at complete political and ideological unity.

In memory of Wilhelm Pieck

WILHELM PIECK, outstanding leader of the German working class and of the international workers' and communist movement, died on September 7th. Pieck's whole life, since his days as a worker when he was persecuted and victimised and up to the time he became the President of the first worker-peasant State in Germany's history, is a striking example of fidelity to the working class, of unswerving and principled struggle for the noble ideas of Marxism-Leninism.

Wilhelm Pieck was born into a worker's family on January 3, 1876. He began work at an early age. In the factories, and while roaming the country in search of work, he saw at first hand the poverty of the working people. At the age of eighteen he joined the organised working-class movement, first in the wood-workers' union and in July, 1895, as a member of the Social Democratic Party. From then on all his energies were devoted to the emancipation of the German working class and all working people.

The year 1896 found Pieck in Bremen, where he spent his first years as a young party functionary. He played a leading role in the strikes of the Bremen workers and taught Marxism. Already in those years he displayed exceptional organizational abilities and was well-grounded theoretically and politically. For him the interests of the working class, of the revolutionary movement, came first. In 1906 he became secretary of the Bremen Social Democratic organisation and was elected to the parliament of the Free City of Bremen.

From the very beginning Wilhelm Pieck resolutely combated the spread of bourgeois ideology in the Social Democratic Party and the opportunist policy of its leaders. At three congresses of this party, in 1908, 1909 and 1912, he vigorously opposed the revisionists and opportunists.

In 1910 he became second secretary of the central educational committee of the Social Democratic Party and simultaneously secretary of its central school.

During the First World War, Pieck fearlessly exposed the treachery of the party leaders who had voted for the war credits in the Reichstag. Together with Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg he conducted anti-war propaganda and founded the revolutionary Internationale group, which later became the Spartakusbund. In May 1915 he organised a women's anti-war demonstration, the first of its kind, to the Reichstag; jail followed, from which he was sent to the front. For refusing to serve in the army he was again imprisoned in 1917, but managed to escape to Holland, where he worked on the anti-war journal *Kampf*, gathering around it the left internationalist forces.

Pieck enthusiastically hailed the Great October Socialist Revolution; he became an ardent disciple of the truth about Soviet Russia and an advocate of Leninist ideas and friendship between the people of Germany and Soviet Russia. He was active in the November 1918 revolution in Germany.

At the founding congress of the German Communist Party (December 30, 1918-January 1, 1919) he was elected to the Central Committee. Ever since and up to the last he played a leading role, first on the Central Committee of the Communist Party and later, after the merger with the Social Democratic Party of Germany in the eastern part of the country, on the Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Party.

During the Weimar Republic Wilhelm Pieck worked indefatigably for a united front of the workers' parties and the trade unions, for strengthening the anti-fascist forces with a view to preventing the Nazis coming to power. His articles and speeches, passionate appeals to the working people, were imbued with the greatest sense of responsibility; Pieck realized only too well that a victory for fascism would bring immeasurable suffering.

After the arrest of Ernst Thälmann, Pieck was elected Chairman of the Party's Central Committee. He played a prominent role in working out the new Party policy at a conference held in Brussels. Together with his fellow Communists, Pieck, like Thälmann, orientated the Party to fight persistently, to unite all who were against fascism into an all-embracing People's Front.

Wilhelm Pieck made a big contribution to the international communist movement. He was active in the Communist International—from 1928 as member of its Executive Committee, and from 1931 as member of the Presidium and Secretariat of the Executive Committee. At the Seventh Congress of the Comintern in 1935 he delivered a report on behalf of the Executive Committee and was elected one of its secretaries.

For more than sixty years Wilhelm Pieck passionately fought against German imperialism and militarism. When the Second World War broke out, he worked in the National Committee of Free Germany. Always and everywhere, whether meeting Social Democratic activists or German writers and, later, prisoners of war—officers and men of the Wehrmacht—his call was the unity of all anti-fascists for the overthrow of the fascist regime and for an early end to the war.

After the war Pieck played a leading part in the formation of the united Marxist-Leninist workers' party—the Socialist Unity Party—in East Germany. He played a decisive part in organising and uniting the creative forces in the National Front of Democratic Germany.

When the first German worker-peasant State—the Democratic Republic—was created, Pieck was elected President. The name and the noble deeds of Pieck as the head of the State became the world-wide symbol of the new Germany, which has abolished forever the rule of the Junkers and the magnates, the aggressive and militarist forces.

Wilhelm Pieck devoted all his energies to the building of socialism in the G.D.R., to the consolidation of the unity of the socialist countries, to the international solidarity of all the Communist and Workers' parties. An ardent patriot, he was a staunch advocate of international proletarian solidarity, a consistent and active internationalist.

Pieck's faith in the triumph of the peace forces, in the possibility of averting war, was boundless.

"For centuries," he wrote shortly before his death, " a world at peace had been the grand dream of the working people, a dream which was unrealisable because of the strength of the forces of war. Lenin's call for peace awoke fresh hope among the people and fortified their aspiration to end war for all time. The policy pursued by the Soviet Union makes possible the realisation of this dream. Now, thanks to the economic and military might of the Soviet Union, the existence of the socialist countries and of the world peace movement, there is a real possibility of opening a new phase in history and of abolishing war forever."

In Wilhelm Pieck the working people of the world have lost an active and selfless fighter for their cause, for peace, democracy and socialism. Pieck was the embodiment of the finest traditions of the revolutionary working class in Germany. His long years of devoted work, his fidelity to the working class and the people are an example to Communists in all countries. The remarkable personality of Comrade Pieck, his ideas and deeds will go down in the annals of Germany, in the annals of the international workers' and communist movement.

Pages from History

The Heroic Path

(On the publication of the "Short History of the Communist Party of Spain")

DOLORES IBARRURI

ONE of the ideological tasks of our Party is to provide the working people of Spain with a handy book in which historical facts and judgments would be combined with clear exposition. *A Short History of the Spanish Communist Party*, notwithstanding its brevity and shortcomings, will be useful in this respect for those young Communists who have grown up under the fascist regime and for the working people generally.

The forty years of the Communist Party of Spain are indissolubly linked with the history of the working class and of the nation. And this is the history of major class battles, revolutions and wars, victories and defeats. After the long period of anarchist and reformist domination in the Spanish working-class movement, in the new conditions created by the victorious October Revolution in Russia, which ushered in the era of communism, the Communist Party appeared as the standard-bearer of the revolutionary traditions of the working class. It had to overcome both the nihilism of the anarchists and the opportunism of the Social Democrats, and instil in the working class the ideas of proletarian socialism and Marxism-Leninism.

In those forty years the Communist Party has traversed a thorny path. Despite lack of clarity on some issues and shortcomings it has always striven to be the real leader of the working class and the progressive forces in the country; its programme has been in keeping with the interests and requirements of the proletariat and all the people. The Party has never wavered in its loyalty to the great land of Soviets, in its faithfulness to Marxism-Leninism.

The Spanish working-class movement emerged in an underdeveloped country whose vast natural resources were plundered by foreign companies. These companies subjected the working people to merciless exploitation. Spain, an agrarian country with deep-rooted feudal survivals, was one of the most backward countries in Europe.

The growth of the productive forces during the First World War sharpened the contradictions in Spanish society to the extreme. The crisis of the bourgeois-landlord regime of the monarchy was further aggravated by the bitter conflict between the workers and the capitalists, between the poor peasants and farm labourers on the one hand, and the landlords, on the other. The task of the day was to get rid of the deadweight of feudalism which stood in the way of national progress, causing stagnation in political and social life.

The working class matured in major battles. Had it formed an alliance with the peasantry, who were in a state of unrest, and with the bourgeoisie, who wanted to abolish the feudal-landlord hegemony, the working class could have led the nation in a bourgeois-democratic revolution, which the development of Spanish society placed on the order of the day. But dominated by anarchism and by the petty-bourgeois liberalism of the Social Democratic Party, the working class was reduced to the status of an auxiliary which the bourgeoisie, aided by the Socialist Party, used for the purpose of bringing pressure to bear on the monarchy in order to wrest political and economic concessions. As a result, the working class sustained heavy defeats during 1916-20.

In the period immediately following the October Revolution in Russia there was a possibility of turning the democratic revolution into a socialist revolution, because the class contradictions had come to a head and the social forces capable of carrying through the revolution had been brought into motion. But this was not understood by the anarchist leaders, vacillating between "pure" ideals and sheer absurdity, and by the socialist leaders, those lawyer charlatans who wanted to use the revolution for acquiring political clients; yet the real revolution, for which they were utterly useless, was knocking loudly at the door.

This situation confronted the working class with the necessity of having its own independent revolutionary party, equipped with a sound programme, a party capable of helping the working class to become conscious of its strength and of its historical mission, and able to guide the revolutionary struggle of the workers, peasants and all progressives.

* * *

A Short History provides many opportunities for a profound study of the history of the

Spanish working-class movement. The history helps to explode the myth that our country and working class are infected with extreme individualism and anarchism.

At first anarchism was alien to the working-class and peasant movements. The working people found their inspiration in Fourier's socialism, Cabet's communism, sometimes in Proudhon's ideas and those of the radical bourgeoisie influenced by the French Revolution; but they were not affected by apolitical anarchism. The working people saw how in the struggle for political freedom their best sons fell under the bullets of the firing squads, how the fighters for the workers and peasants were deported to the Philippines, sent to the galleys for life or strangled with the garrote. So that anyone who tried to tell the Spanish people that political freedom cost nothing, or that political struggle was just a trifle, would be regarded by them either as a hopeless fool or as an enemy. The working class has always fought against dependence on the bourgeois parties, on bourgeois policy, and stood for participation in the political struggle.

The Communist Manifesto was well known in Spain, and the first Spanish Marxists took from it the basic principles of proletarian socialism. But the first congress of the supporters of the First International held in Barcelona in 1870 revealed differences which, aggravated with the passage of time, led, as a result of the treacherous activity of the Bakuninists, to the Spanish working-class movement being split into two main trends—anarchists and Marxists. The working class was consequently unable to exert influence on political and social life in the country for more than fifty years.

The formation of the Socialist Workers' Party in 1879 was a big step forward. But this did not mean that the founders of this Party had completely discarded the bourgeois ideology on which they had been brought up. The leaders of the new party failed to understand that its activity was much more complex as a party of the working class than that of the trade unions, that it went beyond the confines of economic struggle and the immediate needs of the people. While the founders of the Socialist Party deserve credit for their regrouping and organising the working class as opposed to anarchism, and for their struggle for economic demands, their political activity was not free from grave errors and deviations from Marxism. Later, this led to the degeneration of the Socialist Party into a reformist party incapable of guiding the struggle for democracy and socialism in Spain.

For years the Socialist leaders kept silent about the dictatorship of the proletariat. They concealed from the working people and, what was worse, distorted this fundamental principle of socialism, taking their cue from the anarchists. Echoing the reactionary bourgeoisie they rejected the dictatorship of the proletariat, and presented to the socialist workers as a socialist theory a concoction of petty-bourgeois liberal ideas sprinkled with pseudo-Marxist terminology. They invoked Marx's name as a cloak for their petty-bourgeois theoretical jumble.

One of the reasons for the setbacks suffered by our people during their forty-year struggle against the reactionaries and, in particular, their defeat in 1916-20, was the high-handed, scornful attitude which the Socialist Party adopted towards the masses, its inability to understand the role of the proletariat in the democratic revolution, its reluctance to regard the peasantry as an ally of the working class and a motive force in the democratic revolution and, lastly, its underestimation of the national movement.

The October Revolution in Russia stirred the Spanish working people, embittered by the defeat sustained in August 1917. The ruling classes of Spain believed that they had dealt a crushing blow at the working-class movement. But soon they were confronted with a new upsurge of the working people.

On November 25th, 1917, mass demonstrations swept the country; the demonstrators demanded an amnesty for those jailed for their participation in the August movement. At the beginning of 1918 the revolutionary turmoil spread among the civil servants, who went on strike and forced some of the more reactionary Ministers to resign.

The termination of the imperialist war coincided in Spain with a period of bitter struggles —strikes, peasant actions and a rapid upsurge of the national movement. The fight waged by the working people had its impact on the army, and the ground began to slip from under the feet of the monarchy. The situation at that time was such that if a really revolutionary socialist party had been in existence, the crisis which gripped the monarchy would have ended not in the fascist military dictatorship of 1923, but in the overthrow of the monarchy and proclamation of a republic.

The time was ripe for a revolutionary proletarian party. In 1920 an extraordinary congress of the Union of Socialist Youth convened in Madrid decided overwhelmingly in favour of reorganising the Union into the Spanish Communist Party. Some time later the left wing

of the Socialist Party, numbering among its ranks some of the founders of the Party, broke away and formed the Communist Workers' Party. Before long the two bodies merged to form the Communist Party of Spain.

Such, briefly, is the pre-history of the Party. Its deeper roots reach down to the first group of the Spanish section of the First International created in 1868, which based itself on Marxism.

* * *

The history of the Spanish Communist Party as given in the new book is divided into three major stages:

The first stage covers the period from the formation of the Party to the overthrow of the monarchy (1920-30).

The second stage embraces the years of the bourgeois republic (1931-39), during which the Party worked to carry through the bourgeois-democratic revolution. At this stage special importance should be attached to the period of the national-revolutionary war, which is the subject of one of the chapters.

The third stage covers the years of the Franco dictatorship.

This staging, based on the main events in the history of Spain, not on developments in the Party life, is designed to bring out the essential link between the development of Spanish society and the policy of the Party. The staging makes it possible to show the history of the Party, closely linked with the history of the entire working-class movement, as a component and a vital part of the history of Spain. And lastly it enables us better to understand the development of the Party, for this process is shown against the background of the economic, social and political factors.

From the very outset the Party had to work under exceptionally difficult conditions. Persecuted by the authorities, it was forced to go underground. The reactionaries, quick to realise the danger which the Party presented in a country where so much revolutionary explosive material had accumulated, resorted to reprisals. Neither the Socialists nor the anarchist movement were held to be a serious menace to the monarchy. But the Communist Party destroyed the *modus vivendi* established overtly or covertly between the "revolutionaries" and the powers that be; it ended the melodramatic playing at revolutions, in the atmosphere of which revelled people with shady pasts and pursuing still shadier policies—people like Lerroux and Iglesias who longed for "revolutionary" prestige, but who in reality were avowed enemies of the revolution and the working class. This explains why the Left political leaders and the leading Anarchists were so hostile to the Communist Party.

Notwithstanding the difficulties encountered by the Party in its work, in those places where it wielded influence, especially in the mining areas of Asturias and in the Basque country, the workers' struggle assumed an organised character. The style of the Communist Party's work had nothing in common with the whimpering of the reformist leaders and the "come what may" attitude of the Anarchists.

For the first time in Spain the Marxist-Leninist theory of the proletarian Revolution was freed from the obscurity of anarchist idealism and the haziness of reformism, both of which, each in its own way, wanted to postpone the revolution to the "Greek calends" and were responsible for so many missed opportunities to take Spain along the path of democracy.

The advent to power of the dictator Primo de Rivera in 1923, who imitated the methods of Italian fascism, revealed to all that anarchism as a revolutionary force had no significance whatever. It became equally obvious that the policy of the social democratic leaders was a stagnant pool. At this period, known as the "seven disgraceful years", the Communist Party was the only political force which opposed the dictatorship.

The Anarchists dissolved their organisations to please the regime, while the Socialist Party instructed their leaders to collaborate with Primo de Rivera. The working people, who had begun to fight against the regime, rejected this policy of surrender and collaboration. Strikes and other actions of the workers, resistance by the peasantry, opposition of the intellectuals and some sections of the bourgeoisie, helped to overthrow the dictatorship in 1930 and, in April 1931, to bring down the monarchy.

The proclamation of the republic was a big victory for the people. But the Socialist Party succeeded once again in bringing the working class, the mainspring of the struggle against the monarchy, under the political sway of the bourgeoisie. As a result the Republic, headed by the bourgeoisie and the petty bourgeoisie in collaboration with the Socialist Party, did not abolish the feudal survivals, and neither did it drive from the political arena the black forces of reaction and fascism. These forces, left intact, were permitted to prepare for

revenge. The tragic experience of Spain confirms Lenin's thesis about the inability of the bourgeoisie in the new historical setting to lead the bourgeois-democratic revolution.

When after the proclamation of the Republic the Communist Party emerged from its eleven years underground and semi-legal existence, it had been greatly weakened by brutal repressions. Its activity was further hampered by the sectarianism of the Party leadership, which adversely affected its ties with the masses. The big strikes and the struggle of the workers and peasants for land and bread, for the democratic revolution and against the inconsistent policy of the Republic and Government, brought to light the discrepancy between the sectarianism of the Party leadership and the new requirements produced by the existing situation.

Nineteen-thirty-two saw a decisive turn in the history of the Party. At the Fourth Congress held in Seville in March of the same year its policy was radically changed. The main task facing the Congress was how to overcome sectarianism and to take steps that would lead to a really mass Party. Shortly after the Congress the sectarians who had held back the Party were removed from their posts, and a new leadership headed by José Diaz was elected. Ever since, as far as the basic issues are concerned, the Communist Party of Spain has pursued a correct policy based on the principles of Marxism-Leninism as they apply to the Spanish conditions. The Party began to extend its contact with the masses and really became the vanguard of the working class.

The policy of unity runs through the history of the Party. At the time of the monarchy and especially under the dictatorship of Primo de Rivera, the Party worked hard to establish a united front of the working class in its struggle against reaction. After 1932 the policy of unity made considerable headway. The Party pursued the policy of working-class unity even when the Socialist Party—then in the coalition governments—incited the latter to anti-communist actions.

While exposing the reactionary policy of the social democratic leaders and pointing to the special danger of this policy at a time when feudal and capitalist reactionaries still retained their positions, the Communist Party strove for agreement with the Socialists in order to block the way to the ultra-reactionary political forces which, after Hitler's advent to power, became more aggressive and provocative. The effort extended by the Party resulted in an agreement between the Socialists and Communists to organise the workers and democrats to repel the first attempts of the fascists to seize power in 1934.

Joint action by the Socialists and Communists in the Asturias, in the Basque country, in Madrid and elsewhere paved the way to better understanding, which culminated in 1935 in the formation of the anti-fascist bloc and in 1935 of the People's Front which won tremendous popularity both in Spain and abroad.

This is one of the most important lessons to be drawn from the history of the Party. Consistency in pursuing the policy of unity, flexibility in relations with other political forces —which does not exclude criticism of wrong attitudes and makes no concessions in matters of principle—loyalty to agreements and determination in action, even in those cases when the actions lack preparation (for instance, in 1934 when the masses took to action the Party joined in without reservation and was prepared to make any sacrifice for victory)—this is essential not only for the record but also for guiding and educating the younger members of the Party and all those taking part in the struggle against the Franco dictatorship; it is also important for the winning of democracy in Spain.

Through their experience in the struggle against fascism the masses learned the significance of unity and its strength. The joint action carried on even after the 1934 defeat sapped the dictatorship, broke up the reactionary bloc and cleared the way for the powerful democratic upsurge which ended in the establishment of the People's Front and the formation of the Democratic Government.

When the Spanish reactionaries, relying on the army and with the backing of Hitler and Mussolini, staged an armed rebellion to cut short once again the peaceful democratic development of Spanish society, the Communist Party acted as a powerful national force, as the true champion of the working class and of the nation, acted as the decisive factor for the unity of republican Spain. The Party's efforts helped to create the conditions which made possible the prolonged and heroic resistance to the fascist aggressors.

During the long months of war against Franco and the naked intervention of the two fascist powers, the Party spared no effort in organising the army and educating the masses politically; it brought into play the inexhaustible resources of heroism latent in the people and released their creative energy. The important democratic transformations made in the

course of the national-revolutionary war turned Spain into a democratic republic of a new type which though not yet a socialist republic was no longer the republic of 1931.

The Party had travelled a path unknown to the Communist Party of any other country: its activities ranged from participation in the government along with the other parties to the point when it had to wage the war which went beyond national confines and became a war of international significance; in the course of this war the Communists had to resort to all kinds of improvisation, since everything was lacking except enthusiasm and the readiness of the masses to make sacrifices.

The positive role of the Communist Party was fully revealed. Before its formation, and later when the Party went through the infantile disorder of "Leftism", the theoreticians of Spanish socialism, going to extremes in oversimplification, recognised only two types of revolution—bourgeois and proletarian, while the only revolution recognised by the Anarchists, members of the Anarchist Federation of Iberia, and the Anarcho-Syndicalists, was that which would establish their particular brand of "free communism" and federalism.

In contrast to these views the Communists supported the idea of a popular democratic revolution, the need for which derived from the fact that the Spain of the twentieth century, though it had reached a definite level of capitalist development, had not had a bourgeois revolution, with the result that feudal land ownership remained intact, entire provinces—Catalonia, the Basque country and Galicia—were in the position of subject territories, and a colonial policy hated by the people was pursued in Morocco.

This assessment of the Spanish revolution signified that the Communists had rejected the wrong concepts then current among the democrats and in working-class circles; it cleared the way for a regrouping of the forces fighting for the freedom and independence of Spain.

However, some of the Socialist leaders and the Anarchists from the A.F.I. still clung to their pseudo-revolutionary theories and sought to impose on Spain, bleeding from a thousand wounds, all kinds of "revolutionary" experiments; the Communist Party firmly opposed these experiments, knowing that this playing at revolution was grist to the mills of the fascists, undermined the unity of the Republic and alienated the peasants—the backbone of the people's army and one of the motive forces of the revolution.

The second important conclusion to be drawn from the history of the Spanish Communist Party is as follows: the Party should uphold the interests of all the forces and sections loyal to the republic, all Spaniards, organised and unorganised, who fought for democracy and national independence.

With the same resolve the Party defended the interests of the peasants, traders and small proprietors, safeguarding them from confiscation and violence advocated by the so-called uncontrolled elements, upheld religious liberty and fought for democracy. "The Communist Party," said José Diaz, "respects religious beliefs though it does not share them. There are thousands of churches in Spain, and we have no intention of destroying them. If believers want to attend church services, that is their affair. We will not interfere with them."

In 1937 the Communist Party suggested that a referendum, by way of a general election, be held in the country. But this proposal, with which the Party answered the challenge and rumours spread by those alarmed by the growth of communist influence, was turned down both by the self-styled leaders of "pure" democracy and by the ultra-revolutionaries who dreaded the verdict of the people.

The masses reposed their trust in the Communist Party. Between February and June 1936 its membership rose from 30,000 to 100,000, and by March 1937 the figure had gone up to 248,480. The social composition of the Party was as follows: 87,000 industrial workers, 62,250 agricultural labourers, 76,700 peasants, 15,485 of middle-class origin and 7,045 intellectuals. Moreover, 45,000 belonged to the United Socialist Party of Catalonia which, like the Communist Party of Spain, was based on Marxist-Leninist principles and co-ordinated its policy with the Party, with due consideration to the specific conditions in Catalonia, where the national issue was acute.

In the difficult period of the struggle against the fascist rebellion it was necessary to raise an army, to organise war industry, to supply the population and simultaneously to carry out the agrarian reform, under which the working peasants were given the land confiscated from landowners taking part in the rebellion; it was necessary to solve the national question, to attract women to industry and to open the doors of the schools and universities to the working people. The clear-cut policy of the Communist Party, its ability as an organiser and its staunchness stood out in contrast to the confusion, dithering, indecision and reluctance to do anything by those who in peace time had been regarded as the pillars of the republic and of the working-class movement.

Despite the incredible difficulties with which the Party was faced, it succeeded in retaining its political and organisational unity—its unity of will, thought and action. This was its strength and, what is more, is one of the most important lessons to be drawn from its history. The Party was united in principles and in policy, united in the struggle, united in the days of victory and in the tragic days of defeat, united in the desire to bring Spain back to the democratic path. Thanks to its unbreakable internal unity the Party was able to perform herculean labours, to endure the severest strain imposed on it by the struggle. The exceptional diversity of the tasks which the Party was called upon to fulfil, especially at the most difficult moments, made it inevitable that there would be mistakes and weakness, but they were not such as to affect the course of the war or its final outcome.

During the thirty-two months of the war the Party was constantly in the front line. It was the first to organise resistance and the last to leave the battlefield. And it left the battlefield only when some of its former allies, having established the defeatist junta of Colonel Casado and agreeing with Franco to surrender the country to the rebels, treacherously stabbed the republic and the people in the back.

The Franco dictatorship, imposed on our people by the armed intervention of Hitler and Mussolini, put the Communist Party to its severest test. Thousands of Communists and anti-fascists were tortured to death. Others languished in prison for years.

When during the Second World War the fascist ship foundered, the Franco regime survived because of the help rendered by the British and American imperialists. The Communist Party, the working class and the people of Spain were now confronted with the task of overthrowing the fascist regime with their own forces in an unfavourable international situation subsequently aggravated by the cold war.

True to Lenin's teaching on the need to combine legal and illegal methods of activity, the Party formulated its attitude to the trade unions. The policy of national unity worked out in 1942 and the policy of national reconciliation proclaimed by the Central Committee in 1956, and reaffirmed this year by the Sixth Congress, wholly correspond to the situation.

The policy of national reconciliation is in line with our general course for winning democracy. Never concealing its ultimate aim—the establishment of communism—the Party has always said that it will reach its goal by democratic means. The Party's struggle during the forty years of its existence has always been conducted under the banner of democracy, which is proof of its flexible general line and of the broad range of its policy of agreements and alliances, a policy which found its clearest expression in the People's Front.

The policy of national reconciliation presupposes a broad system of agreements and alliances between the working class and the other social forces for the purpose of overthrowing the Franco dictatorship and replacing it by a democratic State without violence and without a new civil war.

The reality of such agreements and alliances is rooted in the specific features which we now observe in Spain: on the one hand, there is the need to heal the split among the people caused by the civil war, and, on the other, there is the possibility of overcoming this split by rallying all the sections of the population—from the proletariat all the way to the non-monopoly bourgeoisie—against the fascist regime, which is simply the dictatorship of the financial and landowning oligarchy.

The Party succeeded in organising large-scale protest actions under the slogan of national reconciliation: the demonstration on May 5th, 1958, and the peaceful national strike in June 1959, which gave the masses a tempering for future action and which prompted other anti-fascist forces to abandon the passivity and overcome the disunity.

If the majority of these forces, including the Socialist Party, is trying to find a way out *behind the backs of the people* (for instance, by way of restoring the monarchy, hoping that Franco will voluntarily make way for the monarchists), the Communist Party is determined to solve the problem *with the help of the masses* in a way that will force Franco to quit under the pressure of a peaceful popular movement based on the unity of all the opposition forces.

But the peaceful nature of the transition from the Franco dictatorship to democracy depends not only on the masses and on us, Communists, who are for a peaceful way without unnecessary suffering. It will depend on the attitude of the bourgeoisie and on the relationship of the forces taking part in the struggle.

In 1936 the People's Front was the most suitable form for a peaceful advance towards democracy, which is why the Communist Party was the most consistent champion of the People's Front. But when the reactionaries, bent on preventing the development of our country along democratic lines, unleashed war against the republic and the people, the

Communist Party was the first to organise resistance and was the staunchest in battle. The experience of the past helps us today and will help us tomorrow. Let nobody have any delusions: should the circumstances impel us to resort to force, the Communist Party will, as before, be in the front ranks and will prove once again that when it is a matter of upholding democracy, sovereignty and independence, of upholding the interests of the people, it will not hesitate to employ the most effective methods of struggle.

• • •

Of the forty years of its existence the Party has spent thirty years underground. Almost immediately after its founding it was outlawed by the dictatorship of Primo de Rivera. It suffered discrimination and was subjected to repressions during the republic. Then came brutal terror under the fascist dictatorship which has oppressed the people for the last twenty-one years. The Party has emerged with honour from these trials.

"I am determined to crush communism," boasted Primo de Rivera when he carried out his *coup d'état* in 1923. But six years later his regime collapsed, precipitating the downfall of the Bourbon monarchy, while the Communist Party continued at its post.

"I have extirpated communism in Spain,"—such is the oft-repeated boast of dictator Franco, who would dearly like to erase from the minds of the people even the recollection of the deeds, the generosity, the nobility and the patriotism of the Communists. And what has happened? Today both friends and enemies recognise the growing influence of the Communist Party, regarding it as one of the outstanding factors of the present political situation in Spain and contrasting it to the profound political crisis of the Franco regime and its steady disintegration.

During these forty years institutions which had been regarded as eternal collapsed; politicians and parties, endowed, seemingly, with permanence, vanished from the scene; dictators and rulers have been laid low. But the Communist Party not only lives on, it is in the closest touch with the masses, and is invincible.

The resolution adopted by the Executive Committee on the occasion of the Party's fortieth anniversary says—correctly—"the forty years of our Party are the history of the appearance of the working class in the arena of political and social struggle, the history of the working class becoming conscious of its historical mission and becoming the leader of all the social forces thirsting for democracy and turning to socialism."

The Communist Party of Spain is active in the struggle. Having behind it the experience of the past, it is again demonstrating its qualities, regrouping its forces, organising the popular resistance against the fascist dictatorship. Now, as in the past, the Party is the force which preserves in the people the faith that in the near future they will win freedom, democracy, peace and socialism. This is the lesson to be drawn from the short exposition of the history published by our Party on the occasion of its fortieth anniversary.

Activities of the Communist and Workers' Parties

Discussing Vital Problems of the Day

(*After the Bucharest Conference of the Communist and Workers' Parties of Socialist Countries*)

THE points contained in the Communiqué of the Bucharest conference are in the forefront of the ideological life of the Communist parties in all countries. They have been discussed by the plenary sessions of the Central Committees of the Communist parties, and speeches by Party leaders and articles in the Party press have been devoted to them. The Bucharest meeting, reaffirming the conclusions of the Declaration and Peace Manifesto adopted by the 1957 Moscow meeting—documents which serve as the charter of the international communist movement, a programme of the struggle for peace, democracy and socialism—focused attention on the vital issue of the day. Of particular importance for the successful struggle of peoples for peace, democracy and socialism in the present situation, reads the resolution adopted by the C.C. of the Communist Party of the *Soviet Union* containing the assessment of the results of the conference, are the Marxist-Leninist postulates "on the characteristic features of our times, on the possibility of peaceful coexistence of countries with differing social systems and of averting war, on the necessity of alerting the peoples with regard to the war danger, since, as long as imperialism exists, the soil which breeds aggressive wars remains, and on the ways of the transition in different countries from capitalism to socialism."

"We maintain," reads an editorial of *Jenminjihpao*, central organ of the Communist Party of *China*, in connection with the Bucharest Communiqué, "that in the current situation, reaffirmation by the Communist and Workers' parties of the socialist countries of the correctness of the Moscow documents of 1957 is necessary and of major significance. . . .

"The socialist countries headed by the Soviet Union have persistently pursued a peaceful foreign policy, advocated peaceful coexistence among countries with different social systems, striven for the settlement of international disputes through negotiation and worked untiringly for the relaxation of international tension."

The crucial importance of the questions raised by the Bucharest meeting is stressed in Party documents which, moreover, draw conclusions concerning the policy and tactics of the parties from a theoretical analysis of the issues.

Everything Must be Done to Avert War

The exacerbation of international tension caused by the provocations of the U.S. imperialists poses the question whether the conclusion about the possibility of preventing wars remains valid. "Recent international developments," states a resolution of the joint meeting of the Central Committee and the Central Control Commission of the *Italian* Communist Party, "while confirming the aggressive nature of imperialism, and of U.S. imperialism in particular, simultaneously attest to the strength of the socialist camp, its ability to rebut the imperialist provocations, to give solid support to the liberation movement of the peoples and, in alliance with all the peace forces, wage an effective fight for peaceful coexistence and disarmament. The idea of the Peace Manifesto that war is no longer inevitable is correct and more topical than ever."

The conclusion about the possibility of averting war derives not from the desire for peace alone, and not from wishful thinking, but from a realistic analysis of the changes that have taken place in the world. "Imperialism is no longer in a position to shape the destinies of the world," reads the resolution of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of *Finland*. "The mighty advance of the countries of socialism, the avalanche of the national-liberation movements in Africa, Asia and Latin America, and the growing struggle for peace in all capitalist countries, open up before the peoples brighter prospects in the struggle for peace, independence, democracy and the triumph of socialism. Despite the danger of aggressive war created by imperialism, world peace and the peaceful coexistence of countries with differing social systems can be ensured provided the people vigorously fight for peace and frustrate the designs of the war-makers."

Reaffirming its profound conviction that war is not inevitable, and holding that the most imperative task facing the American people and the world is to ensure world peace, the National Executive Committee of the Communist Party of the *United States of America* emphasised: "Peaceful coexistence is the only policy which is in accordance with the state of the world today. The basic shift in world relations, which has proceeded since the end of World War II, cannot be reversed. The main historic trend continues: in favour of socialism, of independence from imperialism, of the forces of democracy and progress. Ours is the epoch of the disintegration of imperialism. It is the epoch of the rise, consolidation and final victory of world socialism. In such an epoch, the strength of the world forces arrayed against imperialism must continue to grow, and with it the realistic possibility of averting war between capitalist and socialist States and of establishing peaceful coexistence as a long-term policy."

The enlarged meeting of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of *Japan*, declaring its wholehearted support for the Bucharest Communiqué, expressed the conviction the "the splendid advance of the socialist countries, the scale of the national-liberation movement in Asia, Africa and Latin America, and the growing struggle for peace headed by the working class in the capitalist countries, are good omens for the victory of the forces of peace, independence, democracy and socialism over the forces of international imperialism headed by the United States".

This confidence in the triumph of the peace forces has absolutely nothing in common with fatalism. Victory can be won only in struggle, through rallying all peace-loving and democratic forces, and provided the peoples are alive to the danger.

From their discussions of the Bucharest Communiqué the Communist parties are drawing practical conclusions and outlining measures in the struggle for peace with due consideration for the specific conditions of their countries. R. Palme Dutt, Vice-Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Communist Party of *Great Britain*, wrote:

"In relation to the new effects of the situation since the breakdown of the Summit it may be suggested that we should put as our immediate objectives in the present stage of the fight towards the aim of peaceful coexistence:

"Britain to cease to manufacture, use or provide bases for nuclear weapons. No nuclear arms for Germany. For an immediate international ban on nuclear tests. For the resumption of disarmament negotiations in the United Nations or elsewhere, with firm terms of reference to adopt positive proposals for immediate reduction of armaments on the road to general disarmament.

"No military measures against national liberation as threatened against Cuba and Congo, and an end to repression against the freedom struggle of colonial people. . . . Preparation for a new top-level meeting, with the inclusion of China and India, and for the recognised purpose of replacing the cold war by peaceful coexistence."

The need to step up the struggle for peace was stressed at a plenary meeting of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of *Germany*:

"Recent developments have clearly demonstrated that the peoples, above all the population of the Federal Republic, should display greater vigilance with respect to the military provocations of the aggressive circles in Washington and Bonn. In order to preserve peace the people of Western Germany should, in a united front and with renewed vigour, fight against atomic armament, for ending the armaments drive in the F.R.G. and for a peace treaty with the two German States."

"The people of Denmark should display the utmost vigilance, particularly in relation to the claims of West German imperialism," reads a statement issued by the Central Committee of the Communist Party of *Denmark*. "Military co-operation with N.A.T.O. should be ended, Denmark should be a neutral country. An atom-free zone in Scandinavia and universal disarmament are vital problems for Denmark. The Communist Party is directing all its efforts towards these basic aims."

The resolution adopted by the Central Committee of the Communist Party of *Israel* on the Bucharest meeting said: "Israel's rulers are binding our country more and more to the colonialist and extremely aggressive N.A.T.O. circles. The Government is pursuing a policy of friendship with Hitler's heirs—the Adenauer Government. . . . The Central Committee is confident that the Bucharest meeting:

—will act as a new stimulus in the struggle for peace, national independence, democracy and socialism;

—will be a big contribution to the unity of the socialist camp around the Soviet Union in the noble struggle to avert war, for peaceful coexistence and freedom."

The documents of all the parties testify to their militancy, expose the forces making for war, demonstrate the significance of the advance of socialism for the cause of peace, and explain the role played by the masses in the fight against imperialism.

Liberation Struggle in Perspective

Prominence in the Party documents is given to problems of the transition to socialism, perspectives of the class struggle and the destinies of the national-liberation movement in conditions of peaceful coexistence. Touching upon these questions in a speech at a plenary meeting of the Central Committee of the *French* Communist Party, Maurice Thorez, General Secretary, poined out that ". . . peaceful coexistence does not mean a slackening of the class struggle. On the contrary, experience teaches us that the popular movement acquires greater scope in conditions of an international *détente*. The popular movement is contributing to this relaxation, and the relaxation in turn contributes to the advance of the movement. . . .

"With the deepening of the crisis of imperialism, the spread of socialism and its growing prestige, the chances of the proletarian revolution developing peacefully are becoming greater. This is not an arbitrary hypothesis, nor is it a flight of fancy."

A resolution of the Central Executive Committee of the Communist Party of *India* points out that international developments have brilliantly confirmed the correctness of the Moscow Declaration and Peace Manifesto of 1957, and that it is necessary strictly to adhere to these documents in both theory and practice.

The Communist Party of *India* will continue to support the peace policy of the Indian Government, while simultaneously criticising the Government's weaknesses and shortcomings. The possibility of preserving peace and of the policy of peaceful coexistence does not mean, however, agreement with the thesis of abolishing conflicts between the exploiters and exploited in any country, or of a gradual evolution of capitalism into socialism. The working people in alliance with all democratic and progressive elements should constantly and persistently fight against monopoly landlords and imperialists, in defence of their democratic rights and civil liberties, and to improve their conditions.

The resolution of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of *Argentina* says that "the people are winning more and more success in the fight for peace, democracy and national independence; this can be seen from the recent downfall of the reactionary dictatorships which relied on the support of U.S. imperialism (South Korea and Turkey), from the fall of the governments bought by this imperialism (Japan and Italy), the growth of the national-liberation movement in Africa, and the rapid spread of the anti-imperialist and democratic movement in Latin America, the highlight of which is the victorious march of the Cuban revolution.

"These facts show that the struggle for peace is simultaneously a struggle for national independence, because the same force which is resisting the national-liberation movement, namely, imperialism, in particular U.S. imperialism, is also the source of the war danger."

Speaking about the link between peaceful coexistence and the national-liberation movement, Blas Roka, secretary of the Popular Socialist Party of *Cuba*, addressing the Party's Eighth National Assembly, said: "The loss by the imperialists of any position in the underdeveloped countries signifies a sapping of the base for their bellicose designs.

"Any anti-imperialist struggle and any new anti-imperialist government promotes the growth of the peace forces and creates a new base for peaceful coexistence.

"Any success and consolidation of the socialist countries is at the same time a consolidation and success for the cause of peaceful coexistence, and helps the struggle against war and the danger of war. . . .

"Preservation of peace and success for peaceful coexistence further the development of the Cuban revolution."

A declaration adopted by a conference of the *Dominican* People's Socialist Party among other points stressed "the people of the Dominican Republic are deeply concerned in lessening international tension and ending the cold war. Behind this pernicious policy the Trujilla regime has increased its military potential and become the breeding ground for provocations and imperialist aggression in the Caribbean. An atmosphere of peace and mutual respect, which with renewed energy the peoples are demanding, creates better conditions for the democratic struggle of our people, and will assist in restoring normalcy in the Caribbean."

Approving the Bucharest Communiqué the Central Committee of the *Syrian* Communist Party declared that "the firm policy of peace and peaceful coexistence, the steadfast struggle against another war, for complete demilitarisation, for a ban on atomic and hydrogen

weapons and the means of their delivery, are of great help to the national-liberation movement throughout the Arab world and elsewhere, enabling the Arab people and the other peoples of the world to expose American and British imperialists—avowed enemies of the Arabs—who on the pretext of defence against an invented danger from international communism or the Soviet Union seek to build military bases and establish their sway in the Middle East."

World-Wide Unity of the Communists

Characterising the role of the powerful bastion of world peace—the socialist camp established on the initiative of the Communist and Workers' parties of the socialist countries—Wladyslaw Gomulka, First Secretary of the Central Committee of the *Polish* United Workers' Party, addressing a meeting of the Katowice Regional Party Committee, said: "The unity of this camp is the well-spring of its strength. The peace policy of the socialist countries and the might of the socialist camp represent the decisive factor in the struggle of all peoples for a lasting peace."

Even the slightest weakening of the unity of the socialist forces would be regarded by the imperialists as the best of gifts. The Bucharest conference, however, and the documents of the Communist parties in support of the Bucharest Communiqué, have demonstrated the indissoluble unity of the Communists. *The Canadian Tribune*, reporting a statement by the National Executive Committee of the Communist Party of *Canada* in support of the Bucharest Communiqué, wrote that "the reaffirmation of the solidarity of the Communist parties contained in the communiqué of the Bucharest conference is by no means a matter of private interest to Communists. On the contrary, it is of vital importance to the struggle for peace in the world. The firm, indestructible unity of the Communist parties, and of the socialist States, is the mightiest bulwark of peace, and the main guarantee of the victory of the cause of the working class. . . .

"Differences of views and of estimations which arise between Communist parties from time to time with respect to tactics are resolved on the basis of discussion between friends within the framework of full unity of their main goals."

Unity of the communist movement is not something immutable or mechanical; it develops in the struggle against deviations from revolutionary theory, on the basis of constant enrichment of Marxist-Leninist ideology.

The ninth plenary meeting of the Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Party of *Germany* pointed out in its resolution that unity of the communist movement is not just a formality, not unity for unity's sake; it derives from the fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism, the correctness and viability of which have been fully borne out by practice, by history. The Socialist Unity Party is in wholehearted agreement with the Bucharest Communiqué; it abides by the Declaration and Peace Manifesto of 1957, consistently upholds the guiding principles of these fundamental documents, and applies them creatively in its practical work.

"Success in the struggle against imperialism, for peace and socialism," it is pointed out in a resolution passed by a plenary meeting of the Central Committee of the *Rumanian* Workers' Party, "is guaranteed by: unswerving fidelity to Marxism-Leninism and ability to apply this great teaching in the conditions of modern social development; steadfast struggle against revisionism, Left sectarianism and dogmatism which lead to underrating the forces of peace and socialism, to immobilising and confusing them, to incorrect assessment of the tasks confronting the Communist and Workers' parties; it is guaranteed by cementing the unity and solidarity of the world communist and working-class movement, the fraternal unity of the socialist countries."

A plenary meeting of the Central Committee of the *Bulgarian* Communist Party, welcoming the Bucharest Communiqué, saw the basic condition for still greater success in the struggle for peaceful coexistence in "the firm Marxist-Leninist unity of the Communist and Workers' parties of the world, in the fraternity and friendship of the countries of the socialist camp headed by the U.S.S.R., in the unity of all progressive, democratic forces working for peace and to banish war from the life of mankind. In this respect the struggle against revisionism which distorts the revolutionary principles of Marxism-Leninism, and against dogmatism which prevents the Communists from applying and developing Marxism-Leninism in the specific situation, is of particularly great significance."

The *Hungarian* Socialist Workers' Party, reads a resolution of its Central Committee, is aware that "the essential condition for the success of the policy of peaceful coexistence is

steady consolidation by the Communist and Workers' parties of their ideological and political unity and unity of action." "To work to further consolidate the unity of the socialist camp headed by the Soviet Union," stresses the resolution of a C.C. meeting of the *Korean* Party of Labour, "is the paramount international duty of all Communist and Workers' parties. The Party of Labour together with the fraternal parties will continue to exert every effort to strengthen the solidarity of the socialist camp founded on the principles of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian dictatorship, to cement the unity of the Communist and Workers' parties." Determination "tirelessly to fight, together with the fraternal parties, under the banner of proletarian internationalism and Marxism-Leninism, for closer unity of the world communist movement" is voiced in the resolution adopted by the enlarged C.C. meeting of the Communist Party of the *Lebanon*, which unanimously approved the results of the Bucharest conference.

Antonin Novotny, First Secretary of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, addressing the national conference of the Party, said: "The international communist movement has now emerged on to the broad highway. It will never adopt the opportunist positions of revisionism, nor will it be diverted by dogmatic phraseology on to the path of isolation. It will fight persistently against imperialism, for peace, democracy and socialism, and steadfastly uphold the interests of the working people."

Revolutionary practice can be successful only if it is illumined by a correct revolutionary theory, if Marxism-Leninism makes a timely analysis of the new developments and draws the necessary conclusions from them. It is only natural that in carrying out their tasks in the new international situation the Communist parties are developing Marxism-Leninism, elaborating in a more profound way the vital problems of theory and practice.

Guatemalan Party of Labour Holds Congress

DESPITE the adverse conditions of working underground, and overcoming incredible obstacles and difficulties, the Guatemalan Party of Labour has held its Third Congress, at which all Party organisations were represented.

The First Congress (September 1949) united the various Marxist groups which had come together for the purpose of founding the Party. The Second Congress (December 1952) established the Party and endorsed its programme and constitution. The Third Congress summed up the results of an extremely important period of struggle both in conditions of legality under the progressive Arbens government (prior to 1954), and in the underground during the reactionary regimes imposed by U.S. imperialism.

The Congress approved the Central Committee report and adopted a political platform which shows how to win democracy, national independence and well-being, shows the way to peace and socialism. This document reads: "Our Party is a genuinely Guatemalan Party; a multitude of threads bind us to the people. We are the heirs to the best traditions of Guatemala, of her outstanding leaders. Our Party is the main instrument in the struggle against injustice and exploitation, against imperialism and war."

The Party points to the grave economic and political situation in the country: agriculture is stagnating, while industry, controlled by North American capital, is developing very slowly. The standard of living has further deteriorated as a result of the economic slump. In the political sphere there is complete subordination to the *diktat* of U.S. imperialism, while civil liberties are trampled underfoot.

This socio-economic structure of our underdeveloped, semi-colonial and semi-feudal country is explained by the fact that the 1954 imperialist intervention forcibly interrupted the revolutionary process aimed at changing this structure.

The antagonism between the productive forces, on the one hand, and, on the other, the semi-feudal relations and imperialist domination which act as a brake on their development, is manifested in the struggle waged by the workers, peasants, middle sections and national bourgeoisie who want to see their country take the path of progress—against the U.S. imperialists, big landlords and compradore bourgeoisie, who are resisting this progress. In keeping with this basic contradiction the Guatemalan revolution will be an agrarian, anti-imperialist, democratic and people's revolution.

The same could be said about the revolution from October 1944 until 1954. The democratic forces were then led mainly by the progressive wing of the national bourgeoisie and the revolutionary petty bourgeoisie. The working class, too, played a considerable role, and left its imprint on the major gains of the revolution.

With the overthrow of the revolutionary government power passed into the hands of the counter-revolutionary forces. Since then the government has been the instrument of the reactionary classes, expressing the interests of the big landlords, the compradore bourgeoisie and U.S. capital.

The basic trend among the democratic forces is in the direction of steadily regaining its lost positions, although this process has its ups and downs, its victories and defeats, and assumes now peaceful, now violent forms. But the national-democratic revolution for which the Communists are working goes beyond the confines of the 1944 revolution, which was limited in many respects. The new revolution should complete the national-democratic tasks, and for this it is necessary that the working class should be the leading force.

The Communists would like to see the patriotic and progressive forces win as painlessly as possible. But should the imperialists and the ruling classes resort to violence to preserve their privileges, they will have to bear full responsibility. The democratic and popular forces should be prepared for the most diverse forms of struggle.

The aim of the Party at the present stage is to establish a patriotic, revolutionary and democratic government representing the working class, the peasantry, the petty bourgeoisie and the national bourgeoisie. This government should carry out the following programme:

—an agrarian reform with the land going to the peasants free of charge; abolition of imperialist control over the economy, expropriation of the land, means of production, resources and communal enterprises now owned by the big imperialist companies; extension of foreign trade, which should become multilateral trade;

—substantial improvement in the conditions of the people; higher wages and incomes for workers, peasants and the middle sections, increased purchasing power with a view to abolishing the unjust distribution of the national income;

—establishment of an effective democratic system guaranteeing the rights and liberties of the people and enabling them to choose a system in the best interests of Guatemala;

—complete independence based on economic emancipation and comprehensive sovereignty without any subordination of the country to foreign forces; a foreign policy of peace, international co-operation and avoidance of military blocs and plans.

A government of this kind is an indispensable condition for carrying out the democratic revolution which, in its turn, will open up a socialist perspective before the country.

The ultimate aim of the Party is to build socialism in Guatemala when conditions are ripe for this and when the people express themselves in favour of it. The Party has also formulated a programme of immediate demands.

The way to achieve the aims set lies through struggle to regain the positions of the democratic forces. On this path the Party will support any popular and democratic movement against the reactionary regime; it is trying to find the ways and means of struggle which would bring closer and rally all the democratic and progressive forces of the country.

The Party is ready to fight for its programme as a whole and for each particular demand jointly with the other progressive parties and forces. At the same time it warns the people against illusions about partial changes and transient successes. Only the formation of a patriotic government can ensure the steady advance of the revolution.

The struggle of the Guatemalan people is part and parcel of the struggle of all the nations of Latin America. Recent times have seen a rise of the Latin American revolutionary movement, which has accumulated a rich experience of both peaceful forms of struggle during elections, mass actions, street demonstrations and armed struggle, including a civil war which resulted in victory for the Cuban revolution. This process reflects the disintegration of the colonial system and is a manifestation of the basic feature of our times—the transition from capitalism to socialism.

The ideas of peaceful coexistence and economic competition between socialism and capitalism are finding support among ever-growing, influential sections, and are in the interests of all nations.

Preservation of peace helps the development of the revolutionary movement in Latin America and the struggle of our people for national sovereignty, for democratic rights, and for social, political and economic progress. "The fight for peace and against war," reads the document, "is of the utmost significance for our Party and is one of its basic tasks."

The Congress also adopted a resolution on Party work in the countryside and the work of the Patriotic Union of the Working Youth. It sent messages of greeting to the C.P.S.U. and to the other fraternal parties. The resolution "On Solidarity with Cuba" expressed

support for the Cuban people and their revolutionary government, and denounced U.S. imperialism's aggression against Cuba and the subservient, pro-imperialist attitude of the present Guatemalan government. In a message to the Popular Socialist Party of Cuba, the Congress voiced the determination of the Party of Labour to frustrate the designs of the imperialists to turn Guatemala into a base for aggression against Cuba.

The delegates paid tribute to the Communists and to all the revolutionaries who fell in the struggle against imperialist intervention and the reactionary governments; they salute all imprisoned democrats and freedom fighters.

The Central Committee elected by the Congress has been replenished with new forces drawn from the working class. The average age of the C.C. members is thirty-five.

The Third Congress has shown that the Party has completed rehabilitation following the defeat of the democratic forces in 1954, and that it has now entered upon a period of growth and further consolidation.

S. AL.

Success for the Policy of Unity

THE general elections of July 20th, 1960, in Ceylon resulted in an important victory for the popular forces over imperialism and domestic reaction. The victory, which once again cleared the path for the completion of the anti-imperialist and democratic stage of the Ceylonese revolution, strikingly confirmed the correctness of the policy of unity which the Communist Party has steadfastly pursued.

A Bit of History

The "Dominion Status" which British imperialism conceded to Ceylon in 1948 was not the completion of the national liberation struggle, but a brake upon it. In order to check the rising tide of national and working-class struggles that followed the end of the Second World War, British imperialism entered into open and secret agreements with the Ceylonese compradore bourgeois and big feudal sections who were represented politically by the United National Party (U.N.P.). The essence of these agreements was that political power would be transferred to these reactionary domestic sections who, in return, would guarantee Britain's strategic and economic interests in Ceylon and collaborate with it in common opposition to the rising nationalist and socialist movements.

The Fifth Congress of the Communist Party in 1950 exposed the true nature of this political deal. It called for the unity of the working class and national-bourgeois forces to defeat the reactionary alliance between imperialism and the U.N.P. and complete the tasks of the national-liberation struggle.

Although this call for a united national front against imperialism and its Ceylonese allies was resisted both by the national bourgeoisie and by sectarian elements within the working-class movement, the Communist Party persisted in its struggle. Its policy won ever wider acceptance as a result of the disastrous experiences of disunity in the general elections of 1952, when the U.N.P. won a big victory, and as a result of the success of united mass action in 1953 which forced the resignation of the U.N.P. Prime Minister.

The Sixth Party Congress, which met on the eve of the general elections of April 1956, summed up the experiences of the struggle for unity and called for an electoral alliance between the Sri Lanka Freedom Party (S.L.F.P.), the main party of the national bourgeoisie, and the forces of the Left, including the Communist Party. Although such an alliance was established only partially, it resulted in the defeat of the U.N.P. and in a sweeping victory for the progressive forces. This victory upset the political alliance between British imperialism and Ceylonese reaction, and released the brake placed on the national-liberation struggle in 1948.

The period that followed the electoral victory was characterised by intense struggles between the forces of progress and reaction. The government of Mr. S. Bandaranaike, which was formed after this victory, was essentially national-bourgeois in character. It was elected on a programme of anti-imperialist and democratic demands which included the declaration of an independent republic; the removal of the British military bases; the nationalisation of foreign investments; a foreign policy based on the Bandung principles; the democratic reform of the Constitution, the administration and the electoral system; recognition of and friendship with the socialist countries and the anti-colonial Afro-Asian states; and the rapid development of the national economy.

The Communist Party headed the struggle of the people to see that the aims for which they had voted were realised. But the struggle to implement the aims of 1956 met with bitter resistance from imperialism, both British and American, and from Ceylonese reaction. They sought to divide the nationalist and socialist forces by employing the weapon of anti-communism and chauvinism and through the instigation of racial riots. Using their entrenched positions in the economy, the armed forces and the public administration, and acting through Right-wing elements within the government and the ruling Sri Lanka Freedom Party, who maintained close connections with them, the imperialist and Ceylonese vested interests pursued a dual policy of exerting pressure on the government to abandon the 1956 programme and, at the same time, preparing the conditions for the overthrow of the government itself.

These reactionary forces were objectively aided in their plans by the sectarian tactics pursued by two parties of the radical petty bourgeoisie. One of these parties[1] had entered the government. Although it fought for certain progressive measures, particularly in the field of agrarian reform, it directed its main fire against the small landowners and petty traders, while leaving foreign imperialist and compradore capital and the big feudal interests untouched. Reaction was quick to make use of this to drive a wedge between these middle strata and the rest of the progressive movement. At the same time, this party refused the co-operation of the Communist Party and the mass movement in effecting these reforms, and relied mainly on administrative measures. The big landlords were able to use this fact to sabotage these reforms and even make the peasantry suspicious of them.

The other party was the Lanka Sama Samaja Party (L.S.S.P.) or Ceylon Socialist Party. Although it had a certain support among the better-off sections of the workers, this party basically reflected the outlook and aspirations of the English-educated upper stratum of the population, whom imperialism had created to man the middle rungs of its administrative and commercial services and to act as a buffer between itself and the mass movement. The leadership of this party had embraced the poisonous doctrine of Trotskyism which enabled them to be anti-capitalist in words and anti-communist in practice.

Despite these obstacles, the people and the Communist Party were able to make some headway in implementing the aims of 1956. An independent and peaceful policy was established in external affairs. Relations with the socialist countries were opened and developed. The British naval and air bases in Ceylon were liquidated. Nationalisation measures were carried through, the conditions of the workers improved, and the electoral system reformed, with the vote at eighteen years of age. All these advances were made on the basis of unity and in the teeth of fierce opposition from foreign and local vested interests, whose pressures on the government became more intense.

The Conspiracy Is Exposed

When the reactionaries set out to negotiate a "loan" from the U.S.A., the Right-wing Ministers, who had sabotaged every effort to use the generous assistance given to Ceylon by the Soviet Union, China and other socialist countries, raised demands that the 1956 programme should be abandoned, that the radical elements should be expelled from the government and that there should be a new, anti-communist declaration of policy. They were able to force a Cabinet crisis, and even to establish a temporary hegemony over the middle sections of the government who had been estranged by the sectarian tactics of the V.L.S.S.P.

Although the Communist Party alone fought to unite the progressive forces, isolate the Right-wing and expel them from the government, it was not strong enough to do so. Reaction profited from the lack of unity and was able to expel the radical elements from the government. But it reckoned without Prime Minister Bandaranaike, who refused to become their prisoner or yield to their demands for the complete abandonment of the 1956 programme.

By the assassination of Prime Minister Bandaranaike, foreign and local reaction hoped to remove the last remaining obstacle to their complete supremacy. A new government, headed by Mr. Dahanayake, the leader of the Right wing in the S.L.F.P., was formed, and immediately declared a state of emergency under which democratic liberties were suppressed and conditions for a reactionary *coup d'état* prepared.

But the reactionaries reckoned without the people. The Communist Party and other progressive forces fearlessly exposed in Parliament the foul conspiracy and the true nature

[1] This party, led by Mr. Philip Gunawardine, was originally called the V.L.S.S.P. or Revolutionary Socialist Party. In 1959 it changed its name to M.E.P. or People's United Front.

and meaning of the anti-communist policies of the reactionaries, which were directed against independence and democratic rights. The funeral of Mr. Bandaranaike became the occasion for a mass demonstration against the reactionary conspirators and in support of the 1956 policies.

The reactionaries, who had hoped that Prime Minister Dahanayake would be able to stabilise a government of the Right, realised that he was unable to do so and that the developing mass movement, if not arrested, would lead to the rout of the Right wing. Accordingly, Parliament was abruptly dissolved in December 1959, and a general election fixed for March 19th, 1960, in the hope that it would pave the way for the return of the U.N.P.

The Communist Party once again proposed an electoral agreement between the forces of the Centre and the Left so that they could present a united front against reaction. But its appeal fell on deaf ears and the progressive forces entered the elections divided. The main part in frustrating the efforts at unity was played by the L.S.S.P. whose leaders fondly believed that they could defeat all the other parties and form a government of their own.

Instructive Lessons

The results of the March 19th elections showed that the majority of the people still supported the anti-imperialist and democratic programme of 1956. The forces of the Centre and the Left, who broadly fought the elections in support of this programme, secured 71 seats and over 50 per cent of the popular vote. But the division of the popular forces could not make this vote effective. As a result, the U.N.P. was able to form a minority government although it had won only 50 seats out of 151 and secured only 28 per cent of the popular vote.

Reaction tried hard to stabilise the U.N.P. government and convert it from a minority into a majority government by bribery and intimidation. Every reactionary force, from the imperialist companies and diplomatic agencies to the hierarchy of the Roman Catholic Church, came to its aid. But the U.N.P. government lasted only thirty-three days, and was defeated decisively when it first faced Parliament.

The results of the elections had profound effects both within the S.L.F.P. and the L.S.S.P., and confirmed the correctness of the policy of the Communist Party. Most of the anti-communists within the S.L.F.P. had been exposed either as conspirators behind the assassination of Mr. Bandaranaike or as agents of the imperialists, the U.N.P. and the Catholic hierarchy. They had either been expelled or had quit the party.

The election debacle of the L.S.S.P. intensified the political crisis that had been maturing within this party for some time. Two special conferences, summoned within weeks of each other, witnessed sharp debates that showed that the L.S.S.P. had entered a stage of profound crisis of its general line. These conferences recorded a victory for the forces in the party who repudiated its earlier sectarianism and were anxious to seek greater unity with the S.L.F.P. and the Communist Party.

These developments led to a position where the S.L.F.P., with the support of the Communist Party, the L.S.S.P. and other forces, was in a position to form a progressive government when the U.N.P. government was defeated. But rather than allow this to happen, Parliament was again dissolved and a second general election ordered for July 20th, 1960.

By this time, however, the Communist Party's long struggle for unity had begun to show positive results. An electoral agreement was concluded between the S.L.F.P., the Communist Party and the L.S.S.P.

Although this agreement was, in the first place, limited to the avoidance of contests between those three parties, it began to take on the forms of mutual support as the election campaign developed. It was the basis of a wide unity from below, leading to the formation of joint election committees and other forms of united action.

The unity generated in the election struggle was strong enough to meet and overcome the combined onslaught launched by foreign and local reaction on behalf of the U.N.P. The foreign companies, the newspaper monopolies, the Catholic Church and other reactionary forces did all they could to disrupt the electoral alliance and help the U.N.P. Once again, the main weapons used were chauvinism and anti-communism, including forgeries and provocations directed against the Embassy of the U.S.S.R. in Ceylon. But the people fought back. The three parties to the electoral agreement won 93 out of the 126 constituencies they contested, while the U.N.P. was victorious in only 30.

The new S.L.F.P. government that was formed after the election has far less representa-

tion of vested interests within it than was the case with the government formed in 1956. It has already announced a programme of measures that will help to weaken the power of reaction and develop the natural economy with the aid of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries.

The fact that this victory was won in open struggle against chauvinism and anti-communism has made it more difficult for imperialist and local reaction to use these weapons in the way it did in 1956.

In the course of the election campaign unity of action gained strength. The struggle for further advance, however, remains hard and difficult. Although politically defeated, reaction still retains a strong influence over the armed forces, the public administration and the commanding heights of the economy. In the election, too, the U.N.P. was able to increase its vote by gathering all the reactionary forces around it. Already a new campaign has started, with support from reactionary circles abroad, to intimidate the new government and prevent it from taking any steps that will adversely affect imperialist investments in Ceylon.

The Central Committee of the Communist Party, meeting after the elections, issued a programme of interim demands and called for united action by the people and the government to implement them. It also decided to convene a congress of the Party at the end of this year.

The main tasks before this congress will be:

(a) to work out appropriate measures in order, step by step, to transform the unity created in the election struggle into a stable National Front;
(b) on the basis of the new development within the L.S.S.P., to intensify the fight for working class and trade union unity; and
(c) to begin the transformation of the Communist Party into a mass party.

PIETER KEUNEMAN,
General Secretary of the Ceylon Communist Party.

The Newspaper and Mass Campaigns

IT is generally recognised in Latin America that Uruguay has the unenviable "privilege" of being the country with the most corrupt press, hostile to everything progressive and democratic. Newspapers carry editorials paid for by the U.S. Embassy, or they reprint materials lifted from the official bulletins of the U.S. Information Service. This domination of the imperialist press, the press of the latifundists and Big Business is a big handicap to the democratic and patriotic movement. The Communist Party, naturally, concentrated on launching a newspaper which would actively help find democratic and patriotic solutions to the problems facing Uruguay.

And so the paper, *El Popular*, was the product of the mass drives in the course of which the funds necessary for its publication were collected.

Having appeared as a genuinely people's paper, it quickly gained the experience of campaigning for the people's demands. These campaigns, closely linked with the parliamentary work of the Party and with the activity of its basic organisations and the trade unions, have strengthened working-class unity and enhanced the prestige of the Party.

How are these campaigns conducted? The methods vary, but it is usually the publication of exposures, of trade union demands and of the proposals submitted by parliamentary deputies and the Communist municipal councillors. The paper's correspondents visit workers at home and write up their stories.

For example, a campaign for adopting a law on sick benefits for building workers was conducted. The paper played a big part in organising the workers' action. When the bill was enacted, the paper continued to publish reports from factories and working-class districts, in which the people showed that their gains had become possible thanks to the combined action of the trade unions, the Communist M.P.s and the support of the paper.

El Popular has sponsored solidarity campaigns with strikers, calling on the people to aid them by means of money, food and clothing, often turning the editorial office into the office of the solidarity movement.

The paper has featured the struggle waged by the public health employees for an increase in their meagre wage. *El Popular* published numerous interviews with their union leaders and reports from hospitals. The government was forced to make concessions which a few months later were withdrawn on the pretext of "economy"; and when the working people

protested it resorted to persecution, arrests and fines. The Communist M.P.s raised the matter in Parliament and exposed the arbitrary action. The paper's correspondents were the first to extend moral support to those arrested.

El Popular featured the peasant action in the south of the country. It took part in the fight for the demands put forward by pensioners, students, teachers, office workers and in the campaign to raise funds for public education.

The paper, a strong advocate of a united trade union centre, exposes the pro-U.S. agents in the Trade Union Confederation. *El Popular* published the statements made by union officials of various trends. Its effective campaigning for the people's demands has contributed to trade union unity and to building a united front of the broad masses.

The paper's reporters and photographers accompanied workers from provincial towns or farm labourers who walked hundreds of kilometres in order to lay their claims before the central authorities. They shared all the hardships of the marches.

El Popular has always linked the fight for particular demands with the main political problems facing the country. It made its contribution to the ousting of U.S. firms from the meat-packing industry. In defending the union rights and other democratic freedoms and in combating the wage freeze, the paper helps to deepen the political consciousness of the workers, explaining to them that every attack on their rights and on the standard of living is made in keeping with the plans of the International Monetary Fund: it exposed the attempts made by this Fund to prevent trade with the socialist countries by means of a special currency law; it is campaigning for extending ties with the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries. It has also elucidated the main political and economic aspects of the question of trade—trade is a contribution to peace, to an independent foreign policy, to the economic development of the country; it has shown how this issue is closely tied up with the tasks of every trade union, in particular with the question of unemployment. The newspaper has carried numerous statements by working-class leaders, representatives of other social strata and legislators in favour of trade with the U.S.S.R. and calling for a peaceful and independent foreign policy.

In the course of mass campaigns the newspaper helped to organise numerous public meetings at which Party leaders spoke. These campaigns have been an important factor in reaching the target for new members, which was advanced in connection with the fortieth anniversary of the Party in September.

We have spoken mainly about the campaigns for the workers' demands. But the paper does not confine its activity to this. It champions peace, solidarity with Cuba, and tells the people about the social and scientific achievements of the socialist countries. A series of special editions appeared in defence of Cuba and, at the request of readers, the paper twice printed in full the text of the Cuban agrarian reform law.

It was not surprising therefore that when *El Popular* recently marked its third anniversary thousands of union and factory committee leaders took part in the celebration. Among the speakers were people of differing views, but all pointed to the correctness of the main line of the newspaper, to the fact that it had conducted effective campaigns, selflessly served the workers and fought for the establishment of a united trade union centre. Some of the leaders handed over donations on behalf of their unions, thereby emphasising that it is not only a Communist Party paper but a tribune of the people as a whole.

This is evident from the support rendered *El Popular* by the people. More and more non-Party people refer to it as their paper. Whenever workers win a wage increase, children's allowances and insurance benefits, etc., they immediately give donations to the paper which champions their cause. They consider it quite natural to do this, for they know that the paper helped them to win these gains.

In addition to the usual channels *El Popular* is distributed by groups of Party members and sympathisers, especially on Fridays when its literary supplement comes out. Special reports from the factories, articles on political campaigns and Party documents are, as a rule, published on Fridays. If the issue carries a report about the particular enterprise or district the local Party branch arranges for sales at that place. To build circulation is one of the most important tasks of our distributors.

While noting these successes we should say that we are not fully satisfied with the newspaper. Its strength lies in its anti-imperialist stand and in its championing the demands of the working people, in fighting for the organisational unity of the working class, for unity with the Socialist Party, and for a united front of all democratic forces. *El Popular* can do a still better job in expressing the interests of all the people and the opposition to the reactionary designs. The paper could be more to the point in showing the ways of a democratic and

patriotic solution of the problems agitating the public and in popularising the decisions of the Communist Party and the programme of the united trade union centre. At public meetings the people repeat almost literally what *El Popular* says about the International Monetary Fund plan, the currency reform which will worsen the workers' conditions, etc. It is essential that the broad masses equally understand how their political and economic problems should be solved.

The newspaper should devote more space to the role of the Communist Party, its tireless struggle on behalf of our people, its fidelity to Marxism-Leninism, and the need to increase the membership. The measures undertaken in connection with the fortieth anniversary of the Party have enlivened the campaign in defence of its ideology and have helped to explain the importance of the ideological and organisational strengthening of the Party.

Nor are we satisfied with the present circulation. If every Party organisation were to turn *El Popular* into a means of its struggle the sales would go up and many of those who now read it only during strikes would become permanent readers. We need also more correspondents in the factories, in the rural villages and in educational establishments.

El Popular maintains close contact with the masses. Trade unionists who refuse to touch the reactionary press organs warmly support our paper. We are convinced that its prestige and circulation will grow.

EDUARDO VIERA,
Director of "El Popular".

July 1960.

Fortieth Anniversary of the Communist Party of Australia

BY the end of the First World War the class-conscious workers of Australia increasingly felt the need for new ways in the working-class movement. The founding of the Labour Party in 1891, though it was a step forward in independent political action of the working class, did not change the situation radically because of the reformist ideology of this Party. Nor did anarcho-syndicalism, which exerted influence on the workers disappointed with reformism before and during the war, succeed in providing the alternative. It was the Great October Socialist Revolution which showed the workers a new way forward. The penetration to Australia in written form of the experiences of the Bolshevik Party, in particular the writings of Lenin, led to the formation of the Communist Party in October 1920. This marked a new stage in the history of the Australian working class.

While the Party made clear its ultimate aim of replacing the capitalist system with a socialist Australia, it has always fought for the immediate interests of the working class. It was the first in the country to point to the growing threat of fascism and war; the Party worked to unite the people for resistance to imperialism and in support of the peace policy of the Soviet Union. It has tirelessly shown that the struggle for the economic needs of the people is inseparable from the struggle for peace. The struggle waged by Communists has developed wide influence among the trade unions which have increasingly come to adopt the standpoint "Peace is union business".

The Communist Party co-operates with all who sincerely want to preserve peace, no matter what differences exist on other questions. The Communist-led workers have fought against imperialism and war under the banner of proletarian internationalism. This was particularly manifest in the boycott of Japanese goods and protests against sending pig iron to Japan which had invaded China; in the support for the Spanish workers and peasants during the civil war in Spain; in the broad campaign of solidarity with the Indonesian revolution of 1945-46, etc.

Defence and extension of the democratic rights of the working people, as well as a high standard of living, have always been a major concern of the Party. It has opposed the attempts to steer the trade unions towards class collaboration and the efforts of the reaction to subordinate them to the employers. Because of its genuinely class policy the Party has always been the main target of attack by the reaction.

The Party displayed great staunchness during the reactionary onslaught on the communist, movement. When in 1940 the Menzies government banned the Party it continued its work and won back its legal status in 1942. In 1951 the people frustrated a new attempt by the government to ban the Party. Similar attempts were also undertaken later, but every time they were doomed to failure.

The history of the Communist Party has included a constant struggle against both Left and Right opportunism. In 1956 and after the Party utterly defeated a group of revisionists thereby greatly consolidating its ranks.

In the forty years of its history the Party has grown; its unity has become stronger and the ties with the workers have extended. Over 90 per cent of the members are industrial workers.

On the basis of working-class unity, the Party works to build a people's movement extending the alliance of the workers and working farmers to embrace all sections of the people exploited by capital. This task is dealt with at length in the Party paper, *Tribune*, and the theoretical journal *Communist Review*.

The Party will make the celebration of its fortieth anniversary the beginning of a fresh advance with a view to increasing its membership.

Books and Journals

The Inviolable Principles of Socialist Foreign Policy

THE Foreign Policy of the Soviet State[1] is a collection of over a hundred articles and speeches by Lenin on the foreign policy of the socialist state. Brought together in this book they acquire a special significance and a special interest now. The book, which covers the period between October, 1917, and March 1923, is a kind of summary of Lenin's pronouncements on the foreign policy of the socialist country. To this day these ideas have served as the guiding lines of the foreign policy of the Soviet Union and of the other socialist countries.

The Communists want to see established between all nations relations which would be genuinely friendly and which would rule out hostility and enmity. ". . . Our aim," wrote Lenin, "is to see a socialist system which, by abolishing the division of mankind into classes and all exploitation of man by man and of one nation by other nations will inevitably rule out any possibility whatever of war."[2]

Lenin answered the question: What kind of relations should there be between the capitalist and socialist countries as long as socialism has not been established in all countries?—and what is more, adduced scientific grounds for the policy of peaceful coexistence of countries with differing social systems.

• • •

Nowadays all kinds of falsifiers are searching in Lenin's works for "contradictions" and "discrepancies" between his ideas and the foreign policy of the socialist countries, the new elements introduced by the Communist parties since his death. The purpose of these "investigations" is to cast doubt on the consistency of the Soviet Union's foreign policy of peace. Some of the falsifiers, picking out of context passages in which Lenin speaks about the hostility of the imperialist countries towards Soviet Russia, especially during the intervention and civil war, warning against the danger of an imperialist aggression and calling for vigilance, draw "conclusions" about the "belligerent" and "aggressive" nature of Lenin's teaching. This "theory" is advanced, for instance, by Arthur Montgomery in a Swedish magazine.

Lenin's assessment of the aggressive nature of imperialism holds good to this today. Recent events—the torpedoing of the Summit by the U.S. imperialists, their insolent boasting of the intention to continue spying, the nonsense preached by Herter about "open" and "closed" societies designed to vindicate U.S. aggressive policy and the arming of the Bundeswehr with nuclear weapons—cannot but alert the people.

Other bourgeois writers claim that Lenin never used the term "coexistence" since, they say, he disdained the idea of coexistence, being "wedded" to the concept of "instigating revolution". Bourgeois propaganda, especially in recent years, has concocted not a few falsifications on this point. Among those who have lent themselves to this unsavoury business is George Kennan, who at the same time has a few sensible things to say about the need for coexistence.

Lenin's principle of coexistence derives from an analysis of modern capitalist development, from the law of uneven development of capitalism formulated by him. According to Lenin the development of the revolutionary process will proceed by way of individual countries dropping out of the capitalist system when the conditions within these countries ripen for this. Hence, the inevitability of coexistence at definite stages of a single socialist state hemmed in by capitalist countries, or of a group of socialist countries, with the capitalist system.

After the revolution coexistence and the fight for peace became the general line of the foreign policy of the Soviet state, which found expression in Lenin's Decree on Peace adopted by the Second Congress of Soviets on October 26th (November 8th), 1917.

Defining Soviet foreign policy Lenin said: ". . . Everything that our diplomacy can do to put off the moment of war, to prolong the respite, must be done; we have told the

---

[1] V. I. Lenin, *The Foreign Policy of the Soviet State*. Moscow, Gospolitizdat, 1960, 592 pages.

[2] V. I. Lenin, *War and Revolution*.

workers and peasants that we will do all in our power for peace. And this we shall do."[3]

Some of those in search for the "aggressiveness" of communism claim to have discovered a contradiction between the consistent Leninist policy of coexistence and the internationalism of the Communists. The Communists, they argue, want to see socialism established all over the world. Hence, the argument runs, the socialist countries want to introduce socialism in other countries by forcible means. This, of course, is arrant distortion.

It is true that the Communists believe in the inevitable victory of socialism on a world scale and would welcome it. But they are resolutely opposed to spreading communism by force of arms. Communist ideas are not implanted by force, they are the result of the realisation by the masses of the laws of social development, of the understanding that socialism is the sole way out of capitalist slavery. The Communists are firmly convinced of the historical superiority of socialism over capitalism. But they are adamantly against forcing blessings upon anyone. The Communists and all working people in the socialist countries see their international duty not in installing communism elsewhere by means of force, but in achieving economic and cultural progress in their own countries. This demonstrates the superiority of socialism, and enables the socialist countries to help the peoples fighting for their liberation. Looking forward to the situation likely to arise after socialism had triumphed in a number of countries, Engels, in a letter to Kautsky, expressed the view that the socialist countries would, by force of example, convince other peoples of the superiority of socialism. "One thing alone is certain," he stressed: "the victorious proletariat can force no blessings of any kind upon any foreign nation without undermining its own victory."[4] Lenin said the same thing many times. Answering the "Left Communists", who harped on "revolution", he declared: "Maybe the authors believe that the world revolution needs *jogging*, and that it can be jogged only by war—and in no case by peace. . . . Such a 'theory' would be completely at variance with Marxism, which has always been opposed to 'jogging' revolutions, which develop as the acuteness of the class antagonisms that engender revolutions ripen."[5]

Lenin had no illusions whatever about the predatory nature of imperialism, and he deeply analysed its essence and policy. He referred to the imperialists as political brigands, and defined their foreign policy as a policy of aggression, enslavement and exploitation.

Still, he saw the possibility of coexistence of countries with differing social systems.

Pointing to the appearance of the two trends in world politics corresponding to the two social systems—socialism and capitalism—and to the hostility of the imperialist powers towards the socialist country, Lenin noted at the same time that two policies need not lead to suicidal war. It was not his view that the relations between the socialist country and the capitalist states, even the most bellicose imperialist powers, should be those of constant enmity and tension. ". . . Once the balance exists on a capitalist basis," he said, "we must reckon with this and know how to utilise it."[6]

The capitalist countries, Lenin wrote, will have to reckon with the socialist state, establish and develop business contacts with it, first and foremost economic contact. "There is a force which is stronger than the desire, will and decision of any of the hostile governments or classes, and this force is the common world economic relations which impel them to trade with us."[7]

We learn how Lenin was worried about the difficulties of implementing the principles of coexistence or "cohabitation", to use his word, and we see how closely he followed the normalisation of relations with the capitalist countries and was gladdened by its results, how he rejoiced that Russia "has been covered, if it is possible to say so, with a whole series of fairly sound, permanent trade relations, missions, agreements, etc."[8] He attached the utmost importance to the normalisation of economic relations.

---

[3] V. I. Lenin, *Report on the Foreign Policy at a Joint Meeting of the All-Russian Central Executive Committee and the Moscow Soviet on May* 14, 1918.
[4] K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Correspondence*, 1846-1895.
[5] V. I. Lenin, *Strange and Monstrous.*
[6] V. I. Lenin, *Speech at a Meeting of Moscow Party Activists.*
[7] V. I. Lenin, *The Ninth All-Russian Congress of Soviets, December* 23-28, 1921. *Concerning the Home and Foreign Policy of the Republic.*
[8] *Ibid.*

In the very first years of Soviet power Lenin spoke about the decisive advantages of the socialist economy, saying that they would make themselves felt more and more. He regarded the relations between the socialist and capitalist systems as those of competition or, as he put it, a "contest" which capitalism will be forced to accept. Economic competition, he stressed, was a sharp struggle, but a struggle waged by peaceful, not military means. "At present," he said in May, 1921, "we are exerting our main influence on the international revolution by our economic policy. The working people in all countries without exception and without any exaggeration look to the Soviet Russian Republic. This we have achieved. The capitalists are unable to keep silent about this, to hush it up. . . . In this field the struggle has been carried forward onto a world scale. If we solve this problem, we shall win on an international scale, surely and finally. That is why problems of economic upbuilding acquire quite exceptional significance for us."[9]

The superiority of socialism in the conditions of peaceful coexistence is making itself felt more and more, and this cannot but have a revolutionising impact on the people in the capitalist countries. This is recognised even by inveterate reactionaries. Not long ago a book by anti-communist Schlamm appeared in the West. ". . . The essence of the conflict between communism and the West," he writes,—"and this is so incredible that no one dares mention it—is that communism wants peace, thrives and triumphs in the conditions of peace."

• • •

Peaceful coexistence and non-interference in the affairs of other countries do not mean that the socialist countries are indifferent to developments abroad. The imperialists would revel in a "coexistence" of this kind which would give them a free hand in plundering and oppressing other peoples. But the Communists do not see it in this light. Leninism, while it holds that "export of revolution" is alien to the very nature of the Soviet State, simultaneously demands a resolute struggle against the "export of reaction and oppression"—the policy pursued by the imperialist powers and aimed at enslaving other peoples. The question of power is the internal affair of every nation. Proceeding from this consistently democratic principle of sovereignty, Leninism considers it necessary at the same time to *help* all enslaved peoples who have taken the path of just, liberation struggle against imperialsm and the corrupt anti-popular regimes set up by it. "Socialists," Lenin wrote, "should demand not only the unconditional and immediate liberation of the colonies without compensation—and this demand in its political expression signifies nothing more nor less than the recognition of the right to self-determination—but they must render determined support to the more revolutionary elements in the bourgeois-democratic movements for national liberation in these countries and assist their rebellion—and if need be, their revolutionary war—*against* the imperialist powers that oppress them."[10]

The socialist states unswervingly follow this behest. Economic aid to the peoples who have freed themselves from colonial dependance, active support by the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries for the liberation struggle waged by the peoples of Congo, Cuba and other countries—all this expresses the consistently internationalist, Leninist policy.

• • •

Marxism is not a dogma, but a guide to action. This thesis expressed Lenin's attitude to Marxism, of which he was the classical exponent, and to its methods of solving the tasks that confronted the revolution and the Soviet State.

Lenin warned against any cut and dried solution of one or another problem; he demanded that the sum of class relationships should be taken into account in assessing the fundamentals of policy. ". . . If at every sharp turn in history we assess the relationship as a whole, of all the classes, and do not select isolated examples or isolated cases, only then will we feel ourselves standing firmly in the analysis of the probable facts."[11]

In the basic issues of home and foreign policy the Bolshevik Party led by Lenin was

---

[9] V. I. Lenin, *The Tenth All-Russian Conference of the Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks). Closing Speech.*

[10] V. I. Lenin, *The Socialist Revolution and the Right of Nations to Self-Determination.*

[11] V. I. Lenin, *The Fourth Extraordinary All-Russian Congress of Soviets. Report on the Ratification of the Peace Treaty.*

always guided by creative Marxism and not by formulae, cut and dried schemes or dogmas. The Party had no time for stagnant theoretical thought and rejected all attempts to reduce Marxism to dogmatic quoting of indisputable truths without regard for the concrete conditions.

Take, for example, the struggle against the "Lefts" at the time of the Brest Peace in 1918. The "Lefts" who fought against Lenin's proposal for peace, wanted to "die a glorious death for the sake of the world revolution", unaware that the destruction of the socialist state in unequal combat with the imperialists would be a mortal blow to the revolution and to the international working-class movement. Lenin mercilessly exposed the "Lefts" and their essentially treacherous policy. He showed that behind the "Left" phraseology lay dogmatic adherence to obsolete theses, that a policy which expressed the views of the scared petty bourgeoisie whose panic prevented them from seeing the possibility of the Soviet State existing in conditions of capitalist encirclement, had nothing in common with Marxism. Addressing them, he said: ". . . You devoted more effort to learning by heart and committing to memory revolutionary slogans than to thinking them out."[12]

In solving the tasks of the day, including those in the sphere of international relations, the Communist parties are guided by Lenin's approval.

The concept of the possibility of preventing imperialist war can be taken as an example of the way in which the parties creatively apply Marxism-Leninism. Lenin taught that war, which is inherent in imperialism, is one of its basic features, that as long as imperialism exists, war is inevitable and that each war becomes more destructive and monstrous than the preceding one. Lenin saw the real possibility of ending war in the revolutionary destruction of the system which engenders it—capitalism and imperialism.

In Lenin's days, however, there was no force capable of preventing war. At the same time it should be noted that Lenin never held that war was absolutely bound to break out. This would run counter to the spirit of Marxism. He urged us to explain the questions of war and peace to the masses, to strip the veil of secrecy from the foreign policy of the imperialist states, to lay bare the imperialist designs, to show the people that the cause of war lies in the selfish class interests of the capitalists, and to rouse the people to fight for peace.

"The world," he wrote, "has had more than its share of pacifist phrases, professions and assurances—even of solemn pledges against war and against peace—but in most countries . . . there has been all too little readiness to take effective steps, even the simplest, to ensure peace. Yet, on this and similar issues we wish to see a minimum of general statements, solemn pledges and florid formulae, and a maximum of simple, clear decisions and measures that would really lead to peace, or, better still, to complete removal of the danger of war."[13]

But not only were the peace forces unable at that time to nip war in the bud, they lacked, and this was the main thing, the material base for this. Now, however, things have changed. True, the predatory nature of imperialism remains as it was; its tendencies are unchanged—expansion, wars of extermination and enslavement of weaker nations. Consequently the danger of war still exists. But the possibility of restricting the destructive action of the laws of capitalism exists. Lenin foresaw this when in 1920 he wrote about the tendency of "transforming the dictatorship of the proletariat from a national one (i.e., existing in one country and incapable of determining world politics) into an international one (i.e., a dictatorship of the proletariat covering at least several advanced countries and capable of exercising decisive influence upon the whole of world politics)".[14] This prevision has come true.

Speaking about the international relations under imperialism. Lenin pointed out that they were based on and were strongly influenced by imperialist economic relations. At present, the economic and political relations of imperialism are no longer the decisive factors in international relations. New forces and other factors have now taken a hand in their moulding.

The socialist world system, a powerful bulwark of world peace, is exerting an ever-growing political and economic influence on international relations by the very fact of

---

[12] V. I. Lenin, *"Left-Wing" Childishness and Petty-Bourgeois Mentality.*

[13] V. I. Lenin, *Answers to Questions Put by M. S. Farbman, Correspondent of the "Observer" and "Manchester Guardian".*

[14] V. I. Lenin, *Preliminary Draft of Theses on the National and Colonial Questions.*

its existence, by its advance and, as Lenin put it, by the force of example. An important factor is also the national-liberation movement. In addition powerful organisations of workers, women and youth and the broad peace movement have come into being. These radical changes have weakened the capitalist system and the colonial hinterland of imperialism—in many cases the hinterlands have become zones of active struggle against imperialism.

These fundamentally new phenomena, indicative of the new balance of forces in the world, have found expression in the thesis on the possibility of averting war, which was fomulated in the resolutions of the Twentieth and Twenty-First Congresses of the C.P.S.U., in the Declaration and in the Peace Manifesto of the Communist and Workers' parties. This thesis, which is reaffirmed in the communiqué of the Bucharest meeting of representatives of the Communist and Worker' parties of the socialist countries, is a new contribution to Marxism-Leninism. Today, the international situation is such that mankind is in a position to avert war. War can be prevented provided everything is done to activate the world-wide struggle for peace.

• • •

Lenin's behest, which defines the principles governing the foreign policy of the socialist states, was to safeguard and strengthen the future fraternal alliance of the socialist countries.

Even in those days Lenin visualised the basic features of this alliance. The views which he expressed on this question are important, forming as they do the theoretical grounds for the firm unity of the countries taking to socialism. Unity and solidarity, he said, will assure joint protection from imperialist encroachments, development of the productive forces and higher standards of living. These countries will take into account "the trend towards a single world economy, regulated by the proletariat of all nations as an integrated whole and according to a common plan. This trend is already clearly revealed under capitalism and should certainly be further developed and fully consummated under socialism."[15]

The book will enable Communists to acquaint themselves with the history of the foreign policy pursued by the Soviet State in the first years of its existence, with conclusions of the greatest importance in solving the complex questions of present-day international relations. Lenin's ideas give Communists and all working people confidence in the struggle for the great issue of the day—defence of peace.

S.V.

Executors of John F. Dulles' Will

IT is doubtful whether any recent book on a political subject has had such a "success" in the United States as *What We Must Know About Communism*[1] by Harry and Bonaro Overstreet. At the same time the book exposes, perhaps better than any other (and, of course, against the authors' will), the theoretical helplessness and political poverty of bellicose anti-communism.

The book ran into nine editions during last year; to this day it has been described by the reactionary press as "the best text-book on communism" and palmed off on the American reader by the most "respectable" book clubs and societies in the United States.

Herald Tribune reviewer, R. Drummond, who told his readers that it deals with more than communism, went on to describe it as "nothing you have ever likely read". We couldn't agree more. "It sheds such new shafts of light on communist teaching and tactics," said the reviewer, "that everyone who reads it will be better equipped to do his part in arresting its encroachments.

"I think," the reviewer continued, "it is a must for President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles, for Lyndon Johnson, Adlai Stevenson, and Hubert Humphrey, for Richard Nixon and Governor Rockefeller—and for you and me.

"If there is a philanthropist who wants to do something special for his country, he could well buy a few thousand copies of *What We Must Know About Communism* and

---

[15] *Ibid.*

[1] H. and B. Overstreet, *What We Must Know About Communism*, New York, 1959, 348 pages.

give them to the 533 members of Congress, to the top policy-making executives in the government, to high school principals and to college political science teachers. He couldn't spend a few dollars and do more good."[2]

Whether the philanthropist came forward or not we do not know. But that the book got into the hands of people mentioned by the ecstatic reviewer can hardly be doubted. In any case it is a safe bet that it was among the "thirty text-books on communism" which, as the all-knowing journalists assure us, Vice-President Nixon studied while preparing for his recent lecture on communism for Americans.

The boosting of the book is explained by the fact that it continues to provide anti-communists with ammunition.

Attention is drawn first of all by an

Eloquent Admission . . .

The Overstreets reveal consciously or otherwise the reasons which prompted their book —fear of the spread of Marxism and the patent inability of the official propaganda to counterpose to communism something that would attract the people. As the authors say, "this book is not simply about communism, but about it *as a force for our own minds to grapple with* . . ." (p. 21). They state with undisguised bitterness that in arguing with Marxists the advocates of "free enterprise" usually lack faith in the soundness of their own ideals. "The Communists seem so sure of themselves when they argue about their ideology—so ready with their arguments, so confident that history is on their side—that we are inclined, sometimes, to credit them with a strength beyond our own" (p. 56). Propagandists of the American way of life are not equal to the occasion in the battle of ideas in winning the masses to their side. Despite an affected cheerfulness, this pessimism runs through the book. Take, for example the following admission: "Finally, to a greater extent than we may realise, we have let the Communists, by their insistent propaganda, distort our image of ourselves. They have called us war-mongers and imperialists until we, wanting to be neither, have become half-persuaded that we are both" (p. 92).

In their efforts to immunise Americans against communism the Overstreets are not overscrupulous; they distort facts, juggle with quotations and indulge in patent falsification—the history of the past century is made to stand on its head.

The communist movement, born out of the social development under capitalism and called to realise man's age-old aspirations for social justice, is described as the conspiracy of a handful of fanatical utopians. Marxism-Leninism, which derives from all that is best in the world culture and which expresses the vital interests of the working people in all countries, is explained by them as being without natural roots in the life of any nation; the Soviet Union's effort for general disarmament is described as a "new form of aggression".

When the Soviet sputniks made nonsense of the inventions about forced labour under socialism and when it became evident that the socialist countries will soon outstrip the leading capitalist powers in *per capita* output, the anti-communists pulled out one of their old tricks, namely,

"Export of Revolution"

The most refined subterfuge is employed in the endeavour to prove that Communists do not believe in peaceful coexistence and that they want to "export" socialism through violence and war. For this purpose they quote, out of context, from Lenin's address to the Eighth Congress of the Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks):

"[Unless we defended the socialist republic by force of arms, we could not exist. A ruling class will never surrender its power to an oppressed class. And the latter must prove in practice that it is capable not only of overthrowing the exploiters, but also of organising its self-defence and of staking everything for that purpose.]

"We have always said that there are wars and wars. We condemned the *imperialist war*, but we did not reject *war in general*. . . . Of course not. We are living not merely in a state, but in *a system of states*, and the existence of the Soviet Republic side by side

[2] *New York Herald Tribune*, January 30, 1959.

with imperialist states for a long time is unthinkable. One or the other must triumph in the end. And before that end supervenes, a series of frightful collisions between the Soviet Republic and the bourgeois states will be inevitable."[3] (We have bracketed the passage deliberately omitted by the Overstreets since it talks about *defending the revolution.*)

So much is this selected quote to their liking that the authors reproduce it more than once and elaborate on it with the thoughtful comment: "This particular quotation is not simply one among many. . . . Again and again, when Party leaders have not wanted to spell out their full revolutionary intentions, they have employed the phrase about living 'not merely in a state, but in *a system of states*'. It is a phrase that can sound innocent enough in a 'peaceful' context. But every well-schooled Communist, the world around, can complete the quotation in his own mind—and know that the 'permanent revolution' is still on the books" (p. 88).

The Overstreets evidently have in mind the reader who is hardly to know that the Trotskyite adventurers who used the "permanent revolution" slogan as a screen were denounced by the Bolsheviks as petty-bourgeois doctrinaires. The passage quoted refers to the period of the civil war when the Entente rejected the peace proposals of the Soviet government and invaded the Soviet Republic. The war was unleashed by the imperialists and the international situation was such that Lenin and his fellow Bolsheviks believed that the imperialist powers would not become reconciled to the socialist revolution. But what follows from this? One thing only: the Communists have always insisted on peaceful relations with all countries as the essential condition for building socialism. The Soviet Union really was in a "system of states", what is more, in a system of imperialist states, encircled by hostile capitalist countries. And as everybody knows the relations between countries are determined not by one but by two sides. And since in the capitalist countries power was in the hands of the imperialists who had no desire to establish peaceful relations with the socialist country, the latter, notwithstanding its striving for peace, was not in a position to prevent the armed imperialist encroachment on the gains of the working people. So that the armed conflicts between the imperialist powers and the Soviet State had their source not in the policy of the Communists but in that of the imperialists.

At present, when the socialist world system has taken shape and the world forces of peace are stronger than the imperialists, armed conflict between the two systems is no longer inevitable. It follows, then, that there is no contradiction between Lenin's views in 1919 and the present policy of the Soviet Union. But there is a very great difference between the balance of forces in the world at that time and in our days. In Lenin's time socialism was not in a position to impose peaceful coexistence on the imperialists, and the Communists sounded the warning about the inevitability of armed conflicts between the two systems. At present the socialist countries are strong enough to safeguard peace from imperialist encroachments.

Marxists have always rejected the concept of "export of revolution", a concept which the bourgeois idealogues ascribe to them with an obstinacy that might be envied. Replying to the "Left Communists" after the socialist revolution, Lenin unequivocally declared that the theory of "jogging" revolution had nothing in common with Marxism. In passing it should be noted that this statement cannot be palmed off as a "propaganda trick" since it was made during the inner-Party debate on crucial issues of Soviet foreign policy.

Peaceful coexistence is the corollary of the Lenin theory of socialist revolution which is upheld by all communist parties. The proletarian revolution victorious first in one or a number of countries, Lenin explained, inevitably presupposes a long period of coexistence of the socialist and capitalist systems. The working class which in alliance with all the working people has taken state power into its hand is vitally *interested* in this *coexistence being peaceful*, because peace is a vital condition for building the new, socialist society, for this society to demonstrate its superiority over capitalism.

Peaceful coexistence, then, is the general line of the foreign policy of the socialist countries. "The socialist countries," said Khrushchov, "are against war and for peaceful coexistence not because capitalism is still strong. No. We have no need whatever for war.

---

[3] V. I. Lenin, *Report of the Central Committee to the Eighth Congress of the Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks).*

Even such a noble and progressive system cannot be imposed by force of arms if the people do not want this."

And whereas "export of revolution" is a myth, the export of imperialism in the form of economic crises, puppet governments, local wars, military bases, aggressive blocs, etc., is the reality. The socialist countries, of course, cannot be indifferent to this. Naturally they are resolutely opposed to the export of imperialism which prevents peoples from realising their inalienable right to live under the social system of their choice. Designed as whitewash for the imperialists, the myth about the "export of revolution" is bilge, of which there is any amount in the book.

Violation of Common Sense

In an effort to prove the unprovable the authors resort to impermissible methods of thinking (if it is possible to so describe deductions that are deliberately wrong).

Example No. 1. One such device, as the text-books on logic tell us, is the argument known as *ad hominem*—when an unscrupulous opponent who has nothing whatever to say falls back on personal attacks. This is the method of the Overstreets. Marxism, they declare, is not a scientific theory. Why? Simply because . . . "Marx was an angry man" (p. 45). But in the writings of men who knew Marx he is described as a modest man, a man who was most considerate and of noble qualities. The Overstreets try to justify their absurdity by saying that Marx could not get on with the young Hegelians Ruge and Bauer, and criticised their idealism and inconsistency.

Tell us frankly what are the things in the works of Marx and Engels that seem wrong to you? the reader insists.

And the Overstreets answer: Why, look at the poisonous titles of their books: *The Holy Family, The Poverty of Philosophy, Anti-Dühring*! Such is the "proof".

Example No. 2. The book is replete with groundless assertions like this: "Conspiracy was indigenous in Tsarist Russia" and Lenin (you cannot deny this) was born in Tsarist Russia. And so, the Overstreets exult, Lenin was a conspirator. Moreover, "he refined the Bolsheviks' original resort to conspiracy into a detailed science of conspiracy" (p. 59). The authors hush up the fact that in the struggle for a revolutionary working-class party in Russia Lenin repeatedly warned the Bolsheviks against the danger of Blanquism; he denounced the members of the Narodnaya Volya (People's Will) for their conspiracies, for their individual terror and for neglecting political work among the masses. "We are not Blanquists, we are not in favour of the seizure of power by a minority,"[4] Lenin stressed. "To be successful, insurrection must rely not upon conspiracy and not upon a party, but upon the advanced class."[5]

Example No. 3. Another favourite device is a superficial misleading analogy. Here is a typical argument. Marx, they say, writing in 1853, pointed out that one merely needs replace a series of names and dates by others and it becomes clear that the policies of Ivan III (who ruled from 1462 to 1505) and those of Russia today are not merely similar but identical. Ivan III, in turn, only perfected the traditional Muscovite policy which he inherited from Ivan I. Then comes a reference to an article by Engels entitled "The Foreign Policy of Russian Tsarism" (1890). After all this the authors arrive at a damning conclusion about the foreign policy of the U.S.S.R. "This is the kind of imperial policy that once existed in Russia—*and that still exists*". . . . One merely needs "to replace a series of names and dates by others" . . . (p. 259). What puerile "proof".

Even the Overstreets ought to know that the foreign policy of any country is determined by the interests of the governing class, and is an extension of its home policy. In Russia the socialist revolution overthrew the exploiting classes who in foreign policy had pursued an expansionist policy (dealt with by Marx and Engels in the above works) —the same classes now in power in the capitalist West. And so, if we are to believe the Overstreets, the Russia of today is the same as she was under Tsarism. But if that is so why do bourgeois ideologues argue about different social systems (of which not a single word had been said up to 1917) and why do they write anti-communist books? The authors, evidently, cannot make both ends meet. . . .

The book could be a real find for the teacher of logic anxious to demonstrate to his pupils how not to reason. This by no means signifies that the fables about communism

---

[4] V. I. Lenin, *A Dual Power*.
[5] V. I. Lenin, *Marxism and Insurrection*.

derive from the inability of the authors to think in logical terms; *it simply shows that he who tries to refute Marxism cannot but do violence to the rules of logic.*

This distortion of Marxism was designed with a view to persuading readers that peaceful coexistence of the two systems is impossible. This is what the authors say on the subject: ". . . We have no right to ask that our delegates to any summit . . . conference negotiate any agreement with the Soviet Union—on disarmament or anything else . . ." (p. 288). And anticipating the legitimate question of the reader—why, then, negotiate at all—the authors conclude: the West should dismiss the charge that it is reluctant to negotiate, and gain time for strengthening its "position of strength." Clear enough, isn't it?

We would not have bothered very much about this book were it not for a number of circumstances which help to show

How an Anti-Communist Concoction is Catapulted to a Best-Seller

The point is that, contrary to what the blurbs say, *What We Must Know About Communism* is not just an ordinary publication. It sets forth the official U.S. foreign policy in relation to the socialist countries. Saying that the title should be: How to Keep the Cold War Going, William Foster, Chairman of the United States Communist Party writes: "Since it would be too flagrant to finance such a production out of government funds, a more round-about form of subsidy has been chosen."[6] And proof of this, both direct and indirect, is not wanting.

First, the authors are experts neither in Marxism nor in Russia. They frankly declare in the foreword to the book: "We owe a very special debt to certain friends who, having been absorbed with the problem of communism far longer than we, have been able to put at our disposal their libraries of research materials, without which we could not have written this book" (p. 11). And though the "friends" are not named it is not so difficult to guess who the anonymous "experts in communism" are (the second part of the book devoted to the activity of the Communist Party of the U.S.A. resembles both in content and in style the book *Masters of Deceit* by E. Hoover, head of the F.B.I.). As to the "sources" of the fables about communism, the authors are unblushingly frank: "A great many ex-Communists have, by now, told their stories—a handful of them in print, the overwhelming majority in personal consultations with university research teams, ministers and priests, government agents, psychologists and psychiatrists, individual employers. . . ." (p. 43). Thus the confessions of renegades and police agents expelled by the Communists from their ranks are elevated the level of "scientific sources". One might sympathise with the Overstreets for having to rummage in this odorous garbage, had they not done so of their own choice. . . .

When the material was compiled by the various ghost writers in the F.B.I., the State Department and the Intelligence Agency, and when two journalists undertook to rehash the bureaucratic prose, a third and highly important operation had to be carried out—to "sell" the book to the public. And it should be said that it was put over in a really big way. The eighth large edition of the book appeared already in May last year, and in November it was reported that 100,000 more copies are at the printer's. The book featured in radio talks and magazine articles. One of the weeklies presented it as the "Dulles testament", claiming, not without reason, that the Overstreets' considerations about the "senselessness" of negotiations of the heads of great powers and the necessity "to avoid surface agreements" with the Communists, etc., "conform closely to the writings and warnings of Mr. Dulles".[7] The publicity men even managed to get a photograph of Eisenhower absorbed in reading the Overstreets' book. The calculation was simple—for every American it would be flattering to imbibe wisdom from the book which, according to the blurbs, "Secretary Dulles urged President Eisenhower to read".[8]

This is how best-sellers are made in the United States. True, among the best-sellers there are talented works worthy of their place, but the publicity men of the monopolies make doubly sure that in addition to these there are always tracts on anti-communism.

"The general effects of *What We Must Know About Communism*," William Foster notes, "will be to blind even more the reactionary elements, who will be the main readers

---

[6] *Mainstream*, May 1959, p. 39.
[7] *U.S. News and World Report*, February 27, 1959.
[8] *New York Times Book Review*, April 12, 1959.

of this book, as to what is actually taking place in the world. The book will provide soothing syrup answers to a lot of their political fears and wishful thinking. In it, however, they will learn nothing of any value about the communist movement either of this country, or of the world."[9] In order to end the cold war it is necessary to reject the absurd concepts about communism.

There are, as we know, testaments and testaments. Some promise the inheritors wealth, comfort and a life free from the cares of the world. Others leave commitments and debts infinitely greater than the legacy. In this case they bode only interminable wrangling and quarrels with the neighbours. And what has been aptly termed the "Dulles testament" or *What We Must Know About Communism* is in the second category. And the sooner the people of the United States renounce this testament and the services of the Dulles executors, the sooner will they establish peaceful friendly relations with other countries.

E. ARAB-OGLY

[9] *Mainstream*, May 1959, p. 44.

Communications and Comment

Triumph of Life or a Crusade?

PRO MUNDI VITA! For Life on earth! We in Munich would have been happy indeed to welcome the Roman Catholics from all over the world who gathered in our city for the 1960 Eucharistic Congress had it lived up to this motto and really been aimed at preserving life and promoting peace. Many of the participants expected this to be its object when they stepped on German soil where the disasters and misfortunes of two world wars originated and where it would seem people should be more keenly aware than anywhere else of their duty to fight for life, for peaceful coexistence and better East-West relations.

We, the peace supporters, have valiant fellow fighters in the Christian world as well, as is evident from the example of those eminent Catholics, both laymen and clergy, who are taking part in the movement against atomic death side by side with Social Democrats and Communists, and who are protesting against the shameless attempts made to give the sanction of Catholic morality and theology to the atomic armament of the Bundeswehr.

But was it these rightminded people who struck the keynote at the Eucharistic Congress? Did the motto *Pro mundi vita* serve as the guiding principle for the Congress and the twenty-three sessions and conferences of various Catholic "associations" held within the framework of the gathering? Was it this lofty idea that was propounded at the closing service which was attended by more than a million persons? Was the suggestion made by Heinz Graf, a Liturgical Commission member, to work out a "new organisation" for human society adopted? Did the Munich deliberations deal with establishing the kind of relations between nations and individuals which Peter Nellen, Christian Democratic member of the Bundestag, had in mind when he wrote that "security on a military-technological basis, which in view of the atomic rearmament is obviously impossible to achieve, should be replaced by something entirely different, by the only politically possible, rational and morally just solution: disarmament, international *détente* and, finally, regulated coexistence"? [1]

Alas, no ideas of the kind were in evidence in the Congress proceedings.

Cardinal Wendel of Munich acted as "host" to the Congress, the very same Bundeswehr bishop who had profaned his pulpit with bellicose exhortations to the troops of Adenauer's Wehrmacht along these lines: "The enemy is on the left! There is the hotbed of spiritual fission which is a much more deadly danger than nuclear fission." [2] No wonder after this that the army edition of the West German bishops' newspaper *Mann in der Zeit* declared that the highlight of the Eucharistic Congress should be an "international rally of soldiers and military bishops from the different nations".

The religious veil was too transparent to conceal that the culminating point of the Congress was precisely a N.A.T.O.-sponsored *military demonstration*. The sermon preached by Cardinal Spellman of the United States, who manages to combine the functions of a top dignitary of the Church with high military office, showed once again how little the sponsors of the Congress were concerned with religion as such. Spellman's tirade, preached in Munich's Frauenkirche, oozed hatred of communism. He predicted "tomorrow's victory over Soviet domination", the "destruction of communism", and in his peroration urged that "until this happens there can be no toleration of any readiness to compromise".

Spellman's sermons, urging continuation of the cold war and the anti-communist crusade, were complemented, most revealingly, by the tour of inspection he made after the Congress along the western border of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic and the south-western frontiers of the German Democratic Republic. It was hardly by chance that his itinerary took him to those frontier areas of the Federal Republic designated in the German militarists' plans as the bridgehead for an invasion of the socialist countries.

---

[1] Peter Nellen, *Atomare Kampfmittel und christliche Ethik*, Kösel-Verlag, Munich, 1960, 132 pages.

[2] *Echo der Zeit*, No. 27, 1957.

Naturally, Bonn's Defence Minister Strauss could not fail to attend these "purely religious proceedings"—the same Strauss who has inisisted on so indoctrinating the army as to ensure that when it goes into action "power over there (in the socialist countries!) should pass from atheist to Christian hands". Strauss was paraphrasing Adenauer, who, repeating Hitler's words, said during his audience with the Pope: "I believe that in these stormy times God has given the German people a special mission: to protect the West from the powerful influences acting on it from the East."

Both the preparations for the Eucharistic Congress and its proceedings leave no doubt that the keynote and ideological purpose of the assembly were determined by its influential West German organisers. Indeed, no one bothers very much about concealing the fact. For instance, we know from official sources that the Bundestag appropriated a subsidy of 2 million marks to finance the preparations. With the same object Strauss paid out subsidies from the psychological warfare fund to the Christian Democratic Student League, Kolping organisation and the Catholic Youth League.

Moreover, Strauss ordered the commanders of all military districts to provide details for Eucharistic Congress duty. In other words, the Bundeswehr played the gracious host to the Congress. Bundeswehr troops erected an altar; 1,300 delegates from Franco Spain were housed for the duration in an aerodrome hangar; Europe's biggest camping ground, for 100,000 people, was set up on the flying field belonging to the military authorities; another airfield was used as a camping site for Catholic youth. All this, naturally, was accompanied by an appropriate propaganda campaign to eulogise the "Christian Wehrmacht" of Adenauer, Strauss, Spiedel and Heusinger.

It should be noted that these "Christian soldiers", together with the other advocates of militarism and *revanchism* such as the Bonn Ministers Seebohm and Brentano, attended as "guests of honour". Globke, who bears the responsibility for the slaughter of thousands of civilians, was another of the official representatives of the Federal government listed among the "guests of honour".

The sinister spectacle staged in Munich was supplemented by the so-called "action Silbermöve" sponsored by Hans Merkt, a deputy belonging to Adenauer's party. The "action" was officially designed to finance the attendance of Catholics "from mission outposts in Asia, Africa and South America". "Missionaries in the mission areas are a barrier against communism," Merkt explained his idea in an interview printed in *Echo der Zeit*. "They should see for themselves in Munich what backing they have."

What the Bonn rulers staged behind the scenes of the Munich Congress was a demonstration of the strength of German imperialism not only as the mainstay of the aggressive N.A.T.O. and watchdog of reaction in Europe, but also as champion of the master race theory and colonial oppression in Asia, Africa and South America, all in order to impress the foreign participants.

The same spirit prevailed at the special session of the so-called Order of Knighthood held during the Congress to which the most distinguished members of the *Deutscher Herrenorden* (Adenauer is one of them) were invited. Here, too, tradition was observed and the old plans for infiltrating the "German spirit" in neighbouring countries were reaffirmed.

The claim of the German imperialists to leadership in Europe found expression also during the so-called Nordic Days (conference of Scandinavian Catholics), while the desire to exert a direct influence on the Scandinavian countries was reflected in the proposal to unite all Scandinavian Catholics in one see headed by a German bishop residing in Hamburg. Nor was it by accident that traditions established at past Eucharistic Congresses were constantly invoked. The *Kirchenzeitung für das Erzbistum Köln* (May 8th, 1960), recalling the "commendable" outcome of the Cologne Eucharistic Congress of 1909, called a spade a spade and advanced the watchword *Germania docet*—Germany the mentor! "The German character must cure the world's ills", was how it was put on the eve of the First World War.

The Budapest Congress of 1938 was still more definitely geared to preparation for the Second World War. Indeed it was not fortuitous that it was convened in the capital of fascist Hungary. There the soldiers of fascism and the darkest reaction received their blessing for a crusade against socialism, democracy and the national-liberation movements. Strauss and Wendel wanted exactly the same thing now and the story was repeated in 1960 in Munich: "The faces of the soldiers reflect a dedication

to the sacred cause and an inner excitement. The outward order and strict discipline are illuminated by the flame of faith." Unquestioning fanaticism and a blind crusading zeal, the quiet of a graveyard and fascist "order", the discipline of a militaristic, aggressive army—these were the "ideals" revived in Munich.

But 1960 is neither 1909 nor 1938.

True, the aims of the imperialists and *revanchists* have not changed and anti-communism continues to be the main weapon in the ideological preparation of war. However, the bitter experience of the peoples who suffered under the fascist yoke, and also the new alignment of forces in the world prevent the warmongers from flaunting obviously fascist slogans. Hence, capitalising on the religious sentiments of millions, they are camouflaging their criminal aims as "defence of Christianity".

No matter with whom it may ally itself, West German clerical-militarist reaction is no longer able to turn back the wheel of history. It is opposed by the superior forces of socialism, the struggle waged by the peoples against the warmakers. Waging this struggle, we are also fighting for every right-minded Christian, whose religious sentiments we respect and whose striving for peace we appreciate.

Religion is not our cause. But we are conscious of a bond between us and those devout Catholics who think in terms of humanity's welfare and are outraged by the abuse of religious beliefs in the interest of the Bonn *revanchists*. Beset by deep anxiety, they see how disastrous for the Church itself the consequences can be of the attitude of the higher clergy who, as the case was in Munich, identify themselves with the cold-war men, the anti-communist crusaders and the atomic politicians. The peoples spurn those who justify and give their blessing to N.A.T.O. atom bombs and the preparations for a *revanchist* war by the German imperialists.

A. BAYER.

Munich, August, 1960.

"Ny Tid" Distorts our Words

THE Swedish Social Democratic newspaper *Ny Tid* recently carried an editorial entitled "The Communists and Nuclear Weapons". Essentially it was an attempt to polemise with the international communist movement on the issues of peace, disarmament and the banning of nuclear weapons, although on the face of it it was merely a commentary on the article "The Dialectics of Militarism" which appeared in *World Marxist Review*, No. 6 for this year.

The contents of the *Ny Tid* article may be briefly summed up as follows: The editors assume that N. S. Khrushchov's proposal for complete disarmament ushers in a "new phase" in communist policy on nuclear weapons. The substance of this phase, they claim, is that the Communists, having put forward the demand for complete disarmament, no longer insist on a ban on these weapons. "This impression," the newspaper says, "is further strengthened when one reads Y. Arbatov's article in the journal *World Marxist Review*." Several quotations from the latter follow, discussing the influence exerted by the invention of nuclear weapons on present-day international relations and the fight for peace. Then comes the conclusion: "Thus the Russian Communists offer us a choice between peace based on a balance of fear (fear of nuclear and rocket war—*Y.A.*) and peace based on complete disarmament. They realise, of course, that the latter is sheer utopia, and hence it can be assumed that what they really want is to preserve nuclear weapons. . . ."

Such was the new sensational discovery. It was made to appear as if the socialist countries, the Communists, who had always led the fight against nuclear weapons had now made a complete about-turn and were advocating their preservation.

Had the *Ny Tid* issue in question been dated April 1st, the whole concoction could have been taken for a joke, true, a joke in rather bad taste. But the date was August 17th. This warrants a serious examination of the "discovery".

One need hardly say that Khrushchov's proposals for complete disarmament do not in any way signify rejection of the demand for a ban on nuclear weapons. Their true meaning is well enough known, especially in the light of the debates at the last U.N. General Assembly. The Soviet Union indeed wants complete, general and controlled disarmament as the most reliable means to exclude war from the life of the peoples.

Ny Tid has no justification whatever for trying to liken these proposals to a whim of a capricious child who wants either all or nothing. Communists regard complete disarmament as a feasible goal, not as a utopia, but at the same time they know very well that it can be achieved only through persistent struggle against the imperialist forces. Hence, pending complete disarmament they welcome any, even partial progress, so long as it is a genuine contribution to peace and not merely deception of public opinion. That is why they have fought and will continue to fight not only for general and complete disarmament, but also for such partial solutions as reduction of the numerical strength of armed forces, prohibition of nuclear weapons tests and destruction of the means for their delivery, creation of "atom-free" zones in Europe and the Pacific, etc. And all the more so they would welcome the banning of nuclear weapons and the destruction of stock-piles of these weapons. This is of enormous importance for it would be a decisive contribution toward freeing mankind from the threat of war.

All these are elementary truths not only for editors and publishers but even for the casual reader. But perhaps the editors of *Ny Tid* were confused by the article in *World Marxist Review*? Hardly. The thing here is that the Swedish pressmen did not even bother to examine the opinions put forward by the author of the article in question, but simply attributed to him the very viewpoint he argued against.

As a matter of fact, the article in question includes a section entitled "Peace Through Fear or Peace Through Disarmament?" in which the views of those who advocate a "balance of fear" as the only guarantee of peace and on these grounds urge a continuation of the nuclear armament drive are examined and refuted. The section also discusses in detail the reasons why "fear cannot be a stable guarantee of peace". One of these is that "reckless adventurers among the imperialists thrive" in an atmosphere of fear. Moreover, the preservation of nuclear weapons cannot but increase the danger of "accidental" war, which can break out as a result of a miscalculation, a defect in a mechanism, criminal irresponsibility on the part of individuals, and so on. In an atmosphere of hysteria and fear the risk acquires enormous proportions. Lastly, the article pointed out that "peace through fear" is "not only an extremely unstable peace", but also "a bad peace". For the price that has to be paid for it is constant brinkmanship, ruinous military expenditure, militarist domination of political and cultural life, unceasing "cold", "psychological" and other "wars". Because of this, the Communists reject "peace through fear" and advocate "peace through disarmament".

The *Ny Tid* writers employ their strange method of argument—attributing to the opponent the very views he has criticised—right and left. For instance, they say, referring to *World Marxist Review*, that the Communists have renounced the demand for a ban on nuclear weapons on the grounds that in that case the advantages of a balance of fear would be lost and a step taken back "to the past, to conventional wars".

By putting the last few words in quotes *Ny Tid* suggests to its readers that this is a genuine quotation from the journal. Actually, however, the latter refutes such views. ". . . The banning of nuclear weapons and complete and universal disarmament signify not a step backwards, to wars of the classical type or even to the days of the bow and arrow, but a big step forward, towards providing the decisive condition for excluding war from the life of society", we read in it.

How, then, in the light of this is one to assess the attempt made by *Ny Tid* to ascribe to the Communists the views of the proponents of atomic blackmail, and its claim that the Communists, "like their Western opponents, assume that a balance of fear will help to maintain peace"? There is only one answer. *Ny Tid* has committed a crude and primitive falsification. To expose the anonymous authors offers no difficulty whatever, as we can see. And if this were all one might just write a letter to the editor of the Swedish paper and leave it at that.

There is, however, a reason why the *Ny Tid* editorial merits an answer in public. We are dealing here not with a common gutter sheet, but a newspaper published by the Social Democratic Party of Sweden. Hence what it says must in some measure be regarded as an exposition of the views of certain influential groupings within that party. If we examine the article from this angle, we come up against things that are more than strange.

First and foremost the article shows that the Social Democratic circles whose views the newspaper voices not only refrain from supporting the struggle for disarmament,

but do their utmost to discredit it. Not only is the demand for complete and general disarmament declared "sheer utopia"; it is also labelled as an insidious manoeuvre designed to justify the stockpiling of nuclear weapons.

In general, the article makes it patent that there are people in the Swedish Social Democratic Party who have decided to remain bystanders and watch the fight against the danger of war from the sidelines, if not to sabotage it. Moreover, they want to make use of this noble cause, which is in the interest of all humanity, in order to indulge in insinuations against the socialist countries and to fan suspicion and hatred for the Communists. Such an attitude cannot but surprise and alarm all partisans of peace. To say the least, it is a questionable stand for a newspaper voicing the views of a party that claims to uphold the interests of the working people.

Another point. *Ny Tid* is not only a Social Democratic organ, but the mouthpiece of the ruling party of a neutral country. From this point of view its stand is more questionable still. How can those in the Swedish Social Democratic Party, whose views the newspaper expresses, be unaware that genuine neutrality in the present conditions does not mean sitting between two stools, and still less standing in the sidelines? Non-participation in imperialist blocs is, of course, of major importance for ensuring both universal peace and the national interests of any capitalist country. Some favourably situated countries have been able to escape the horrors of war in this way. But in our time mere non-participation in imperialist military alliances is not enough. The very advent of nuclear weapons has radically changed the state of affairs. Take Sweden, for instance. Would she not suffer, even as a non-combatant, in the event of nuclear and rocket warfare enveloping the territory of her N.A.T.O. neighbours, Norway or Denmark, for example?

Clearly, genuine neutrality in our times cannot but imply active work for peace. Many of the countries that have not joined the military blocs and who are working consistently for peace, relaxation of tension and disarmament, appreciate this. That it has not been brought home to a Social Democratic newspaper that is supposed to voice the views of the ruling party of a neutral country is surprising indeed.

The *Ny Tid* editorial is more than a manifestation of journalistic lightmindedness. It offers evidence of something worse, for it cannot be taken as anything but a glaring example of political irresponsibility.

Y. ARBATOV.

NEW BOOKS

(Books are printed in the language of the country of publication; the titles here are given in English)

Articles About Leo Tolstoy. V. I. LENIN. Moscow, the Fiction Publishing House, 1960, 62 pages.

Basic Proportions in Polish Economic Development. S. KUZINSKI. Warsaw, Ksiazka i Wiedza, 1960, 241 pages.

Constitution (Basic Law) of the U.S.S.R. Constitutions of the Union and Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republics. Moscow, Legal Literature Publishing House, 1960, 939 pages.

Czechoslovak-Soviet Relations during the Great Patriotic War of 1941-45. Documents and materials prepared by the Foreign Ministries of Czechoslovakia and the Soviet Union. Prague, Státní nakladatelstvi politické literatury, 1960, 268 pages.

Essays on the History of Religion. From the earliest forms to Christianity. Third edition. Rome, Editori Riuniti, 1960, 324 pages.

For Popular Unity. SANTOS RIVERA. San Juan, Puerto Rico, Editorial Pueblo, 1960, 54 pages.

Fundamentals of Marxist-Leninist Aesthetics. Institute of Philosophy and History of Arts, the U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences. Moscow, Gospolitizdat, 1960, 639 pages.

Impoverishment of the Working People Under Capitalism. I. KUZMINOV. Moscow, the High Party School and Academy of Social Science Publishing House, 1960, 336 pages.

New Resistance. Chronicle of events during the Italian anti-fascist struggle and the general strike of July, 1960; the youth and anti-fascism; participation of the intellectuals. Special supplement to *Rinascita*, Nos. 7-8, 1960, 70 pages.

On Party Work. W. ULBRICHT. Berlin, Dietz Verlag, 1960, 544 pages.

Racial Discrimination in Africa. Institute of Oriental Studies, the U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences, Moscow. The Oriental Literature Publishing House, 1960, 257 pages.

Selected Writings (in four volumes). M. KALININ. Vol. I, 1917-25. Moscow, Gospolitizdat, 1960, 784 pages.

Socialist Emulation in Czechoslovakia. J. PROVAZNIK and F. VLASAK. Prague, Práce Publishing House, 1960, 288 pages.

Soviet State Law. A. DENISOV and M. KIRICHENKO. Moscow, the Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1960, 459 pages.

The Ninth Congress of the Italian Communist Party. Documents and Resolutions. Rome, Editori Riuniti, 1960, Vol. I—565 pages, Vol. II—358 pages.

The Grand Plan. A Soviet Man's Story. Y. MORALEVICH. Moscow, the Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1960, 190 pages.

Thirty Years of Struggle Waged by the Colombian Communist Party. Essay prepared by a C.C. Commission of the Party. Bogota, Ediciones Paz y Socialismo, 1960, 168 pages.

Unity Without Discrimination Is Urgently Needed to Defeat the Enemies of the Working Class and the People. Lessons of Struggle for the Labour Movement. V. MARISCHI. Buenos Aires, Editorial Anteo, 1960, 48 pages.

Published by S. C. Easton, 16 King Street, London, W.C.2, and printed by Farleigh Press Ltd., Hartspring Lane, Aldenham, Herts., England.

WORLD MARXIST REVIEW

is the English edition of

PROBLEMS OF PEACE AND SOCIALISM

published in Prague

All enquiries for subscriptions to *World Marxist Review* should be sent to Central Books Ltd., 37 Gray's Inn Road, London, W.C.1, England.

An English edition is also published in Canada; enquiries for subscriptions to this edition should be sent to Progress Books, 42-48 Stafford Street, Toronto 3, Ontario, Canada.

PROBLEMS OF PEACE AND SOCIALISM

is also published in Russian, Chinese, Dutch, French, Spanish, German, Italian, Swedish, Czech, Polish, Rumanian, Bulgarian, Hungarian, Japanese, Mongolian, Korean, Albanian, and Vietnamese.

Enquiries for subscriptions to any of these editions should be sent to Press Circulation Agency, Sadova 3, Prague 6, Czechoslovakia.